HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Luke 21: 19: *In your patience ye shall win your souls.*

O eternal God, in whose divine control are all our days, we beseech Thee to draw us now near to Thyself that we may not be far from one another.

May we offer our noonday prayer with one heart and mind and with simple faith and sincere love.

Amid all the changes of each passing day may we find in Thee that peace and that patience and perseverance which the world can neither give nor take away.

Whatever Thy will may be for us this day grant that we may serve Thee faithfully and with firm obedience to what Thou dost command.

Thou hast mercifully drawn a cloud over the future but may this not be a weariness or a vexation of spirit but a comfort and a joy that the best is yet to be.

May each new day with its troubles and difficulties be part of the curriculum for the development of our character and the culture of the inner life.

To Thy name we shall give all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7743. An act to establish a system of loan insurance and a supplementary system of direct loans, to assist students to attend postsecondary business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools; and

H.R. 9247. An act to provide for participation of the United States in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex., in 1968, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; and

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 728) entitled "An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936."

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 to the bill (H.R. 205) to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, FEIGHAN, CHELF, RODINO, DONOHUE, BROOKS, MCCULLOCH, MOORE, and CAHILL.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight and tomorrow night to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may speak today in Committee of the Whole may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 335]

Anderson, Ill.	Aspinall	Bonner
Andrews, George W.	Blatnik	Brademas
	Bolton	Brown, Calif.
Colmer	Hébert	O'Hara, Mich.
Daddario	Holifield	Powell
Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Rivers, S.C.
Dorn	Johnson, Okla.	Roncalio
Downing	Landrum	Roosevelt
Flood	Lindsay	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Long, La.	Thomas
Goodell	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Hansen, Wash.	Michel	Toll
Hardy	Mize	Tupper

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONVEY PROPERTY TO SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7329) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in the United States to the city of San Diego, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7329

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services shall convey, without monetary consideration therefor, to the city of San Diego, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property comprising a portion (approximately sixty-seven one-hundredths of an acre) of the Navy Capehart quarters at the Admiral Hartman site in San Diego, California, the exact legal description of which property shall be determined by the Administrator.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 4, strike out "without monetary consideration therefore" and insert in lieu thereof "at the estimated fair market value".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 4644 and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected Mayor, City Council, and

nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 4644, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute offered yesterday by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK]. The substitute which the gentleman offered has had full committee consideration and full committee hearings.

In fact, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] testified on behalf of his substitute, which was then pending before the committee in the form of a bill, for one full morning, and then came back the following day and subjected himself to further questioning.

This substitute, or bill, has obtained the approval of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives, not a clandestine group or a clandestine meeting made up of a group of "yes" men.

Incidentally, while I was in the Army during the war, we had another name for "yes" men.

The committee, in approving the Sisk substitute, approved it with a committee amendment; however, the committee amendment to the original Sisk bill did not lessen the committee support of the basic principle of the Sisk bill. Actually, what the committee did was to put two bills together.

The committee put two bills together. The bill I had originally introduced would provide for 85 percent of the land area of the District of Columbia to be retroceded to the State of Maryland. I believe, of course, this would be the only way in which we could provide the maximum amount of self-government to any of the people who live within the Nation's Capital at this time. This is no question about the constitutionality of this proposal. Actually, a large portion of the district I now represent, Arlington County and the city of Alexandria, used to be a part of the original District of Columbia. Be that as it may, I have been advised unofficially that the committee amendment would not be germane to this bill, and, therefore, I do not intend to offer it. Of course, the main thrust of the committee amendment was to retain 15 percent of this land area as the Nation's Capital under full control of the Congress. I believe we will have an opportunity later on to consider any improvements or perfections in the proposal that the gentleman from California has offered at this time.

One part of the bill or substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and the part that I think is of primary importance, is that it does provide for final congressional approval. It gives us 90 days to act on whether or not we approve or reject the charter which will be drawn up by the people of the District of Columbia. I had planned to offer an amendment requiring congressional approval, but some Members asked me not to offer the amendment because it was felt that 90 days would give the Congress ample time to act.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I am very interested in what the gentleman is saying about the retrocession proposition. I note that some of those who now propose the new approach are recent converts to it. I do not know whether one of the "four horsemen" for home rule is here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. In the last Congress when our subcommittee had hearings on home rule, we had a retrocession proposal by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], who at that time was a Member of the House, which proposal advocated retrocession. We had another proposal which recommended the same thing that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and others are proposing now. But I think it is interesting to note that in the 88th Congress the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], on page 220 of the hearings, said about the Kyl retrocession bill that the bill has "possibility of giving the people in the District true home rule."

On page 265 of the hearings, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] had this to say:

> As between the Kyl proposal and the Multer proposal, personally I would support the Kyl proposal over the Multer proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes inasmuch as I took up his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. The Multer bill at that time was the administration bill, which is almost identical to H.R. 4644.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That is correct. Actually there may be a lot of other things in the proposal offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] that we might want to change or amend. But basically, it is a good bill. It is a sound proposal which, as I said before, has the full approval of the duly constituted Committee on the District of Columbia. After all, there is nothing wrong in compromising or agreeing to act in a spirit of compromise, particularly when it is a true bipartisan compromise.

Now there may be some charges made that this may cause a delay in giving a measure of home rule to the people who live within the District of Columbia. Well, my answer to that charge is, What is the hurry? Have we not done enough damage so far in this session that we had to bring up any more controversial legislation and confusion before this Congress adjourns? This is a very important, serious, and complicated matter. Why should we not hesitate a little bit and proceed a little more cautiously before we act on this very serious and important matter? What is wrong with letting the people of the Nation's Capital determine for themselves what type of so-called home rule they would like to have? This is what most cities and most communities have done, and it is the privilege that most communities have in drawing up their own charter. That is what we are offering to the people of the District of Columbia here. This proposal should overcome all of the objections outlined by the Republican policy committee. It does not permit any repeal of or change in the Hatch Act. It does not authorize the people of the District of Columbia through this charter to create any Federal tax or Federal payment. Certainly if there is any partisan aspect in the charter that they draw up, the Congress will then have a chance to look at it and approve or disapprove it.

I urge my colleagues seriously to consider this proposal offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

This is the way the people of the District of Columbia can be part of the home rule—the type of home rule to which they themselves agree upon through a duly constituted referendum.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment or two relative to the procedure. It is my understanding that amendments are in order not only for the Multer bill but also the Sisk bill at any time. However, I would point out that it is my intention to offer amendments to the Multer bill relative to partisan politics and relative to the Hatch Act. But at this time I wish to speak to the Sisk substitute primarily, and at the same time inform the House what my intentions may be. I would like to point out that to me it is very, very confusing to see the procedure that we will follow, and it is obvious that Members of Congress are not fully aware of what are in the bills that are before us. I think we should carefully consider the Sisk proposal. It would not set up partisan elections. It would not violate the Hatch Act about which I have been so concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the proposal would give the Members of Congress a little breather to look it over. I should like to speak in favor of the amendment.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

I have listened with great interest to this debate and while I support home rule as such, I believe in "home responsibility," for home rule is home responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to pose a few questions to the author of H.R. 11218. If the gentleman is present in the Chamber, I should like his attention.

Referring to the Federal payment section of H.R. 11218, page 56, lines 3 through 11, what real property formerly exempt from taxation would, if the bill should become law, be subject to Federal payment in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MULTER. Will the gentleman clarify his question?

Mr. SLACK. I shall restate my question.

What real property formerly exempt from taxation would now, if the bill becomes law, be subject to Federal payment in lieu of taxes? I am referring to page 56, lines 3 through 11, dealing with the Federal payment on properties other than Federal buildings themselves.

Mr. MULTER. No real property and no personal property owned by the Federal Government would be subject to taxation if the bill as proposed is passed.

I am now talking about the Multer substitute that is pending. There is no taxation provision in the bill as we are submitting it to the House. There is no authority given to the District government to tax any property of any kind that is owned by the Federal Government or that is tax exempt.

All we are doing in this bill is providing an authorization beyond which the Appropriations Committee could not recommend, and the Congress could not appropriate. For the purpose of arriving at the limit of the maximum amount that may be appropriated by the Congress we use this formula that is set forth, a part of which the gentleman has referred to, and which includes real property in the District that may be tax exempt, solely for the purpose of arriving at the valuation of it in determining the maximum amount that may be appropriated.

Mr. SLACK. So the gentleman is saying categorically that buildings owned by the Disabled American Veterans, the American Historical Association, B'nai B'rith, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the DAR, the SAR, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Jewish War Veterans, National Education Association, and others will not be subject to a payment in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MULTER. I am saying precisely that.

Mr. SLACK. A second question I have is this: There has been much said about the $57 million valuation placed upon the Nation's Capitol. What method was used to arrive at this figure? Was it based on true and actual value; that is, willing buyer and willing seller, replacement cost less depreciation, appraised as like property in the area; or was this figure of $57 million just taken out of thin air?

Mr. MULTER. As I understand it, the amount is that fixed by the appraisers as the market value of that property.

Mr. SLACK. This is market value, based upon what sort of method of appraisal?

Mr. MULTER. I assume that the appraisers used whatever is the usual method of appraisal in arriving at that.

Mr. SLACK. Market value is defined by law, I believe in all the 50 States, what a willing buyer will pay a willing seller. Who has offered a price for the building and who is willing to sell the building? This is the only way to arrive at true market value.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman knows of some better method of appraising I suggest that the House in the Committee of the Whole be told about it. The fact of the matter is that this is the valuation that is arrived at solely for the purpose of determining the maximum amount of an appropriation that can be made.

Mr. SLACK. Will the gentleman answer one more question with regard to this subject? What will be the value of the Nation's Capitol next year? Will it be worth more or will it be worth less? Will it appreciate in value or will it depreciate in value?

Mr. MULTER. This is something which only the appraisers who will make the appraisal can tell us. I repeat, it is quite immaterial what they may do. No matter what these valuations are that some appraiser may fix, the Appropriations Committee nevertheless will decide whether they want to appropriate 5 cents, $1 million, $50 million, or $57 million. They will make the determination as to whether or not the appraisals are proper or improper. For that matter they may ignore the appraisals as completely and effectively as though never made. The appraisals are in the nature of a recommendation, without any force or effect in law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Let me say to the gentleman from West Virginia that the answer which the gentleman from New York gave is not consistent with what I understand to be the true situation.

I can give the gentleman the names of some of the organizations whose property will be exempt if the Multer bill is enacted. I can also tell what the tax will be, what the Federal taxpayers throughout the Nation will pay, under the existing real property tax assessment rate in the District of Columbia:

American Legion.
Amvets.
American Historical Association.
American Institute of Architects.
B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation.
Columbia Historical Society.
Disabled American Veterans.
Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association of Washington.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Jewish War Veterans U.S.A. National Memorial.
Luther Statue Association.
National Association of Colored Women's Clubs Inc. D.C.
National Council of Negro Women, Inc.
National Education Association.
National Society of Colonial Dames.
National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Inc.
National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, Inc.
National Society of the U.S. Daughters of 1812, Inc.
National Trust for Historic Preservation.
Society of the Cincinnati.
Protestant Episcopal Parish.
Young Women's Christian Home.
Veterans of Foreign Wars of U.S. in D.C.
National Guard Association.
Woodrow Wilson House.
United Supreme Council, 33d Degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, Prince Hall Affiliation.

There are probably others.

So the Federal taxpayers in your community and mine will pay under this formula in lieu of taxes, if that is what these gentlemen want to call it, on the basis of the present tax rate in the District of Columbia on the real property of these exempt organizations, $649,640.22.

Mr. SLACK. I thank the gentleman for clarifying this point.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point, on that very point?

Mr. SLACK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. The long list of names of organizations which was read to you by our distinguished colleague from North Carolina merely tends, in my opinion, to distort the entire problem presented. There will be no payment in lieu of taxes by any of these people or organizations. I repeat again as vigorously and as forcefully as I can that the value of these properties may be taken into account in trying to arrive at the total limit of money that may be appropriated. Not a dime will be paid out of the U.S. Treasury unless and until it is appropriated and meets with the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and the will of the House and the Senate as it may be worked on the bills brought before them. In arriving at those amounts you can be sure that the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the other body will take into account whether these appraisals are proper and whether the formula is proper and then determine how much, if any, they should appropriate.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I leave it to our colleagues as to who is engaging in efforts to distort. I make the categorical statement that if the Multer bill or the Multer amended bill is enacted into law with the formula now set forth in it, the organizations that I have named and others that I have not named will be made the burden of the taxpayers of the Nation to pay in lieu of taxes the amount I have mentioned. There can be no question about it. If the gentleman from New York wants to distort the issue by trying to interpret what I said as saying that the membership of those organizations would have to pay this amount, then he is entirely in error. I am saying that the taxpayers of North Carolina and New York and every other State in the

Union will pick up the tab for the valuation upon these real properties owned by exempt organizations on the basis of a tax rate fixed by a Mayor and City Council in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order that I may direct one more question to the gentleman from New York. I would ask the gentleman from New York what assurances, if any, do we have that the beauty of Washington will not be marred by the construction of skyscrapers and/or high-rise apartment buildings?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, you have the same assurance after the enactment of this bill as we have today. The Congress has complete control over the situation and we will continue to have that complete control over the situation. I assure you and every other Member of the House and every citizen of the United States to the same extent as we prevented the marring of the beauty of the city of Washington up to now, we will continue to have and to exert and to enforce that same power from here on in after we pass this bill and it becomes law.

Mr. SLACK. The function of zoning will be taken over by the mayor and city council, will it not?

Mr. MULTER. Under the proposal it will go in the first instance to the city council and the mayor subject to the veto right of the President and subject to the right of the Congress to override. If the gentleman will permit me to say one thing further, when I say override, I mean to change, modify, or repeal. Anything that the Congress can do now it can do after this law is enacted.

Mr. SLACK. Then, it might be well for the Congress to set up a watchdog committee, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. We have a watchdog committee now. We do not disturb the jurisdiction of the House District Committee one iota. Under the law and the rules of the House every legislative committee, including the House Committee on the District of Columbia has the right and the duty and the obligation to oversee everything legislative in its jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the statement of the gentleman from New York, the enactment of his bill does not constitute any commitment to the people of the District of Columbia by the Congress on the formula or other aspects. That is so much chaff in the wind.

I want to say, as one of the ardent opponents of the bill, that I do not look personally with much favor upon the idea of holding out a false hope to these folks because, if we pass his bill, the gentleman from New York and every Member of this Congress will have a solemn obligation to deal with honor with the people of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] has again expired.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARSHA. As I understand it, the Committee may now proceed to amend both the Multer amendment and the Sisk substitute to the amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARSHA. And we may amend either one interchangeably at this stage of the game?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARSHA. Then when the vote comes upon the Sisk substitute or amendment to the Multer amendment, assuming the Sisk substitute is voted down, may this Committee then continue to amend the Multer amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Multer amendment, in the nature of a substitute, would at that time be open to further amendment.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire what the procedure will be among the managers on the other side relative to the legislation before us. It is my understanding that as to both the Sisk amendment and the Multer amendment to the original discharge petition bill, amendments are now in order; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just answered that question.

Mr. NELSEN. Is there any disposition on the part of the managers either of the Sisk bill or the Multer bill—perhaps in this case the Sisk bill—to conclude the discussion on the Sisk bill before we proceed with amendments to the Mutler bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously the Chair has no knowledge of what are the intentions of the managers.

Mr. NELSEN. The gentleman now speaking does not have, either, any information on that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think we should take one thing at a time. I hope the gentlemen who are interested in reaching a conclusion on this matter will perfect the amendment now pending—that is, the Sisk amendment. I think we should vote on that and then we will be moving along. But if you undertake to consider all the amendments that probably would be offered to the original bill and to the so-called compromise bill, we will be 2 or 3 days before we get to voting on anything. I would suggest and I would hope the suggestion meet with favor, that we go along and proceed to finish with the Sisk amendment before we go to something else.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment before this body and I offer the amendment in good faith. However, I can understand the difficulty of the procedure if we try to work on two at the same time, and that is my understanding of the procedure under which we are operating. I should like to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] for any observation he wishes to make at this point.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield as has been explained, both the substitutes are pending for amendment, and amendments would be in order. I, of course, would like to have us proceed to perfect my own substitute as rapidly as possible and get a vote on it up or down. From the procedural standpoint I think that would be best.

On the other hand, Members are completely free to offer amendments as they feel disposed to do. I am expressing only a personal opinion but I would hope that we might be able to perfect the substitute which I offered, first, and get it voted on one way or the other.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I shall withhold my amendment for the time.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARSHA. Assuming the Committee sustains the Sisk amendment, then the Committee returns to the House and the House votes down the Sisk amendment, upon what bill do we then proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The question then will be put to the House on the bill, H.R. 4644.

Mr. HARSHA. And, there will be no further opportunity to amend that or any other legislation; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at that point, because prior to that the previous question will have been ordered.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the so-called Multer amendment will be open at any point for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It would be, the Chair will state, and is open for amendment.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I mean when it comes before the body.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now open for amendment at any point.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] asked the question, and I thought he addressed it to the managers of the bill, and thus far no manager on either side has answered the inquiry of the gentleman from Minne-

sota. I would like to answer it and indicate to the gentleman the parliamentary situation, as I understand it.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union has twice indicated that both the Multer substitute and the Sisk substitute are now pending before the committee and open for amendment. No one can stop any Member from offering amendments to either of these amendments. I hope they will be offered one at a time and disposed of one at a time. The time to offer amendments to the Multer amendment is now and this is what should be done. If anyone has an amendment to the Sisk amendment he ought to offer it now. I looked at the desk just a few moments ago and insofar as I was able to ascertain there were no amendments pending to the Sisk amendment. We ought to have an opportunity to discuss the Sisk amendment, pro and con, before we vote on it.

In the meantime, if the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] or any other Member has an amendment to offer to the Multer substitute, it ought to be offered and disposed of now.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read.

Mr. BELL (interrupting reading of amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California that his amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of this amendment, I will ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the amendment is an amendment to the Multer bill to change "partisan elections" to "nonpartisan elections" for District Mayor and City Council.

Mr. HALL. This will be discussed entirely, Mr. Chairman, under the gentleman's 5 minutes to speak in support of his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, what is the length of this amendment so that we can have an idea about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the amendment consists of 3½ pages.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, obviously it is an important amendment. So, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out:
"SEC. 810. Partisan Elections."
and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"SEC. 810. Elections."

Page 6, line 14 strike out "of a political party".

Page 66, in line 13, change the semicolon after the word "Council" to a period, and strike everything after the word "Council" down through line 17.

Page 67, strike out everything beginning with line 5 down through line 6 on page 68, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 805. (a) (1) The two candidates receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for each office in the primary election, except for the offices of councilmen-at-large and for the office of District Delegate, shall be declared the winners, and their names shall be placed on the ballot in the next general election.

"(2) The ten candidates receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for the offices of councilmen-at-large in the primary election shall be declared the winners, and their names shall be placed on the ballot in the next general election.

"(3) The candidate of each party receiving the highest number of votes validly cast for the office of District Delegate in the primary election shall be declared the winner, and his name shall be placed on the ballot in the next general election as the candidate of his party."

Page 70, strike out everything beginning with line 25 down through line 6 on page 71, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) he executes a registration affadavit by signature or mark (unless prevented by physical disability) on a form provided by the Board of Elections showing that he meets each of the requirements of section 807 of this Act for a qualified voter and if he desires to vote in a primary election for District Delegate, such a form shall show his political party affiliation: *Provided,* That the Board shall accept as evi-".

Page 72, beginning with line 15, strike out everything down through line 17 on page 74, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 809. (a) Nomination of a candidate to be included on the ballot for a primary election shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a declaration of candidacy, accompanied by the filing fee in the amount required in subsection (f): *Provided,* That any candidate for the office of District Delegate is duly registered as affiliated with the political party for which the nomination is sought and otherwise meets the qualifications for holding said office.

"(b) Nomination of an independent candidate who desires to have his name on the ballot in the general election for the office of District Delegate shall take place when the Board of Elections receives a petition signed by not less than five hundred qualified voters registered in the District and accompanied by a filing fee in the amount required by subsection (f). No person shall be barred from nomination as an independent candidate in the general election for the office of District Delegate because he was a candidate for nomination in a primary election: *Provided,* That he complies with the requirements of this subsection.

"(c) No person shall be a candidate for more than one office in any election. If a person is nominated for more than one office, he shall within three days after the last day on which nominations may be made notify the Board of Elections, in writing, for which office he elects to run.

"(d) A candidate may withdraw his candidacy in writing if his withdrawal is received by the Board not more than three days after the last day on which nominations may be made.

"(e) Filing fees to accompany a declaration of candidacy in the primary election, or a petition nominating an independent candidate for the office of District Delegate for inclusion on the ballot in the general election, shall be $200 for a candidate for District Delegate or Mayor and $50 for a member of the District Council or a member of the Board of Education. No fee shall be refunded unless a candidacy is withdrawn as provided in subsection (c) or (d).

"(f) The Board of Elections is authorized to accept any nominating petition as bona fide with respect to the qualifications of the signatories thereto: *Provided,* That the originals or facsimiles thereof have been posted in a suitable public place for at least ten days: *Provided further,* That no challenge as to the qualifications of the signatories shall have been received in writing by the Board of Elections within ten days of the first posting of such petition."

Page 75, beginning with line 1, strike out everything down through line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"ELECTIONS

"SEC. 810. (a) Except in the case of candidates for election to the office of District Delegate, elections held under this Act shall be on a nonpartisan basis, and ballots and voting machines shall not show, except in the case of candidates for election to the office of District Delegate, any party affiliations, emblems or slogans, nor shall the candidate or any person or organization acting on his behalf during such campaign represent the candidate in any way or by any means as a member of a political party or receive funds from any political party or related organization."

Page 75, beginning with line 9, strike out everything down through line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] in support of his amendment.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous reasons for recommending nonpartisan elections in the District of Columbia. As my colleagues, I am sure, already know, my amendment merely changes the election system in the Multer bill to nonpartisan elections except for the District delegate which still will be partisan.

First, there is the unsettled question of the Hatch Act and its application to Federal employees who want to participate in local government. A nonpartisan system eliminates this problem since nonpartisan elections are exempted under the Hatch Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do I understand the gentleman's amendment calls for a runoff?

Mr. BELL. Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker. It calls for a runoff after the primary elections.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MULTER. Just to make it clear, this means you require a majority vote between two candidates, for example,

running for Mayor and for the Councilmen running in wards in the District.

Mr. BELL. That is right. There would be two candidates for mayor, using your example, and the top two in the election would be in the runoff in November.

Mr. MULTER. In other words, first there would be a primary election in which any number of people may enter.

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. MULTER. And then the two who get the highest number of votes in that primary must stand for election and the one who gets the majority would be the winning candidate.

Mr. BELL. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. How about if one candidate received more than a majority?

Mr. BELL. That is a very good question. In Los Angeles as in many other cities, this is a problem. We considered this and felt that it would be better to have a runoff regardless of the outcome of the primaries. Sometimes you can have an election in a particular year where there is a lackluster campaign for some reason and there might not be a great deal of interest and therefore there would be a very poor turnout. If one candidate got a majority of the votes in the May primaries, we felt that the people did not have a chance to elect the one candidate they really wanted. It also avoids the unfortunate double standard for the Hatch Act coverage existing in H.R. 11218.

I would also point out the problem of heavily federally impacted cities that seek de-Hatching would then be eliminated. To illustrate, a very interesting thing occurred before the district committee of the Senate. A Senator in the other body proposed an amendment to the Senate bill to provide a "de-Hatching" clause for one of the cities of his State which had a heavy concentration of Federal installations. This Senator made the comment, "Well, you are de-Hatching the District of Columbia area and the District of Columbia people, why not de-Hatch this city in my State?" So you are going to have ramifications of this if we go ahead on a partisan basis.

Second, a nonpartisan local election focuses on local isuses and not on national party issues.

For example, just on that point alone, when it comes to matters such as parking meters and sewerage and so forth, there is no Republican-Democratic issue.

Third, under a nonpartisan system the chances of a local political power structure wielding corruptive influence are greatly diminished. Party affiliation becomes unimportant and with the concentration of Federal governmental operations here in Washington, this takes on even greater meaning.

Fourth, the capable individual candidate comes to the fore in nonpartisan elections. The use of television and other public news media available here in the District would certainly bring out the best men for the right jobs.

As an extension of this, if there was a desire to appoint good people to local government office, which I am sure there would be, such men or women would not be appointed on the basis of party affiliation but would be appointed on the basis of capability.

Again party affiliation becomes unimportant while the candidate becomes all important.

Fifth, the national trend in city government today is for such a nonpartisan system as this amendment suggests.

It would seem to me commonsense for Congress to use the successful experience of other cities and provide the best for the city which the world will look to as the ideal in American government.

I would like to quote again as I did earlier during the debate, from an editorial in the Washington Post of March 10, 1965, which said:

> The obvious answer for this Federal city is nonpartisan local politics. Primary elections can be arranged to encourage the kind of nonpartisan local coalitions that have been very effective in Arlington. The (Senate District) committee would perform a valuable service by taking the national parties altogether out of city elections.

It is a source of amazement to me that this advice has not been taken by some of the leaders in the home rule movement. Why, if Congress is to establish home rule government for the National Capital, do we insist on providing a political structure certain to create added conflicts and problems for Washington's municipal future?

As a Californian, I know from firsthand experience the special applicability of the nonpartisan election system to modern community government. The principle and practices of nonpartisanship in municipal elections had its beginnings in California over half a century ago. Since that time the system has been adopted by municipalities, both large and small throughout the country. As Mr. Patrick Healy, executive director of the National League of Cities, told the Senate District Committee on March 1:

> Detroit is nonpartisan, Los Angeles and San Francisco are nonpartisan. I think Philadelphia and New York are partisan. But I might comment here that in the opinion of a great many students of government, the local governments in California, the cities, are perhaps outstanding in the entire United States in their government, in their operation, their caliber of people that are attracted into the local government. The League of California Cities attributes this, among other things, to the fact that they have nonpartisan government out there.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has strongly supported home rule for the District of Columbia, and who signed the discharge petition which has brought this legislation to House consideration, I earnestly ask that the Congress provide the best possible political framework for District government. Local self-government in the Nation's Capital must be a model for this Nation and, indeed, for the world. A nonpartisan election system is vital to assure good government in the District of Columbia—government free of any taint of spoils, politics, or machine control.

I, therefore, urge that the House adopt my amendment to the pending home rule legislation providing for the establishment of nonpartisan elections in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, I concur with him in his position on the amendment. I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. If the amendment is adopted, what assurance from the conferees will we have that the amendment will be held in the conference?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier in the debate in answer to the same question that is posed, no one has any right to speak for conferees that have not even yet been appointed. I do not know who they will be. I doubt whether the Speaker has given any consideration as to who the conferees may be. In any event, when the House has spoken and has worked its will on the bill, the conferees, no matter who they may be, that are appointed, will be duty-bound to urge the House position in the conference.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman in answer to a question earlier propounded by the Speaker, made a statement. My colleagues around me seem to think that I had misunderstood what the gentleman from California said. I should like to clarify it. I asked him a hypothetical question.

Did the gentleman imply that if you had a primary and there were two candidates for mayor and one of those candidates received 90 percent of the votes in the primary and the other received 10 percent of the votes, notwithstanding that result, the candidates would then continue to campaign until November, and the same candidates would run again at that time?

Mr. BELL. I am happy to answer the gentleman's question. He is, of course, stating a hypothetical situation that is rather remote. First, in the primaries for mayor he would have more than two candidates running in all probability. You would have several. The two highest would be chosen. If the one candidate in the primary received over 51 percent of the votes, which would be a more practicable analysis of your question, they would both still have to run off. The reason for that is very simple. Sometimes, in certain periods—through a lackluster campaign or for many other reasons—there could be a lack of interest in the primary, so that maybe a "51 percent candidate" might not be the choice when a larger section of the populace had an opportunity to vote. So we felt that even though one candidate received a substantial part in the vote, he would still have to have a runoff in No-

vember when perhaps there would be more interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Suppose that in the primary there were, as sometimes occurs in city elections, only one candidate for mayor. Then what would happen in the lackluster campaign? In the fall would there be some way to change?

Mr. BELL. I assume, if there were no other opposition to the candidate for mayor, the candidate in the primary obviously would win the primary election. He would still be on the ballot in the fall.

Mr. WHITENER. Under the gentleman's proposal, a loser would have two strikes at the seat of mayor or on the council?

Mr. BELL. I do not believe that is an accurate statement at all. I believe this is the system which would be the fairest possible way we could devise.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I certainly support the principle about which the gentleman is talking, as to nonpartisan elections.

I do not know how many of the experts on the District of Columbia Committee ever have served as mayors of large communities. I have a feeling none of them did.

I served as mayor of a city of 330,000 people. I know something about municipal government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was a member of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and served as an officer of that group. I believe they know something about municipal government.

I might say that the trend overwhelmingly is toward nonpartisan elections. One gets better people when there are nonpartisan elections.

I certainly believe that if any bill is passed this provision ought to be in it.

I say again that I do not know of any of the people who are proposing this who have ever served in an important capacity in municipal government. If they have, I should like to have them stand up and say so, and debate some of the problems which confront the people.

I certainly believe that if any piece of legislation is passed the Sisk amendment is the only sensible approach.

We had a change in our city from a commission form to another form. The people voted a charter convention. They appointed people to study the various structures. They took more than a year to do so. They finally came back with a recommendation. This was approved by the people. That is the only sensible thing to do, to have a thorough study made, because this is a very intricate and complex problem.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is further proof of our truly bipartisan effort to perfect a good home rule bill. So far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment in furtherance of that bipartisan effort.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I could not be more distressed than I am as I stand in this position of opposition at this time because I have worked so hard and so long with my other colleagues in supporting this legislation it is difficult to part with them now.

Although I am sure this amendment is about to be adopted and that in the final analysis I will have to bow to the inevitable, I really could not live with myself unless I expressed my strong feelings on this amendment; because I do not believe, as has been stressed on this floor, that nonpartisanship necessarily means we will do away with all forms of corruption in government or that we will not continue to have the same problems as otherwise, or that it is an ideal principle of government.

In the District of Columbia I believe some problems will be created. It will be necessary to set up political organizations which do not exist at this time. It will have to be done by May of next year, when there is to be a primary.

As the bill now stands, it guarantees minority representation, for at least 2 of the 19 are to be from the minority party.

I have never lived in a large unit of government where there have been nonpartisan elections, but I am told that the absence of partisan labels does not guarantee a nonpartisan election, and it usually turns out that the elections are partisan.

In the Evening Star for yesterday there was an editorial.

Like many of my colleagues I quote the Evening Star when they agree with my position. It says here that the alleged benefits of such a modification would be illusory. As the experience in other places discloses, the absence of partisan labels does not discourage partisan political activity on the local level but only masks it. Under the amendment as proposed by Mr. MULTER, there is no reason why an independent may not run, and independents may support independents. The two-party system is a good system and has worked well in this country. We are told a nonpartisan system works well in California. I have no reason to believe that the city of Los Angeles or the city of San Francisco are any better run than the city of Baltimore where we do have partisan elections. I understand that the amendment will be adopted, but I did want to express my strong disapproval of this amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I will be glad to.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say here that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] has done an outstanding job in the highest traditions of the House in his work on this bill. He shared a lot of the credit with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for this work. I know something of the pressures that he has been under, representing an area adjacent to the District, and I know some of the unpleasant things that have occurred. I just wanted to take a moment to pay tribute to one of the really outstanding Members of the House for the courageous and key part he has played in this effort, which I hope will come to fruition today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman from Maryland has taken the lead in this particular piece of legislation. He evidently feels he is an expert on the subject. I wonder if he can tell me what the three forms of municipal government are that exist in the United States today.

Mr. SICKLES. I do not know whether we want to go into a quiz contest at this point. I know what the form of government we have under this bill is. I know you have a mayor and a city council, and you have a city manager type of government, and then you have your commission form of government. These would be the three separate forms of government you inquire about.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Were those three separate forms of government discussed by your committee?

Mr. SICKLES. Yes. We discussed these and many others. We discussed setting up the District of Columbia in the form of a legislature, such as in a State or a territory. It was the thrust of some of the bills on one other side of the aisle. Over the years, over many, many years that this subject matter has been discussed practically every idea has been thrown about and considered, and some have been accepted and some have been rejected. I indicated when I first opened the debate on this subject the other day that we could spend many hours discussing each of the particular provisions in the bill. I think we have a good, strong, workable bill which had the support of many of the citizens of this jurisdiction. There have been many open, public hearings. In the District

Committee they had all of the local citizens in so that they could make their representations. Representatives from all over the country have given us advice and counsel. It is a good, workable bill. If the folks in the District of Columbia do not like it, they will not pass it on the referendum which comes in 4 months after the bill is adopted.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, to preface the substantive remarks I will make in a minute or two, I would like to have the RECORD clear that, one, I did not sign the discharge petition; and, two, I voted on Monday against the consideration of this legislation in this manner. I believe I was right in both instances. I think the confusion we are facing at this moment fortifies the views of those of us who did not sign the discharge petition and those of us who did not vote to bring this bill up under this parliamentary procedure.

There is considerable confusion which is very obvious. We have a bill that was brought to the floor under a discharge petition which has been abandoned by everybody; opposed by all. We are now in the process of trying to consider two amendments which are in the form of substitutes: the Multer substitute and the Sisk substitute.

It seems to me that we ought to try and perfect both amendments because at this stage of the game we do not know which one will be the final one upon which we will have to vote "yes" or "no." And may I say at this point that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California was identical with an amendment which had been carefully worked on by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN]. I am sure that under the ordinary course of events the gentleman from Minnesota, ranking Republican on the committee, would have been recognized and would have offered the amendment.

I simply say, when I speak here today, that I am endorsing the Nelsen-Bell amendment.

May I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES]. I strongly believe in nonpartisan municipal elections. This is the growing trend in municipal elections in metropolitan communities in this country. Most newly formed communities of a metropolitan nature are incorporating in their charters a nonpartisan method of selecting public officers, and in many cities they are going from a partisan election to a nonpartisan approach.

My own hometown of Grand Rapids, Mich., for over 40 years has had a nonpartisan city commission type of election. I think our citizens have done a first-class job in running a community of approximately 200,000.

The city is 3 to 2 Republican, but on occasion under this system I will say to my Democratic friends we elected men who were recognized as Democrats. Naturally, most of our mayors, even though they did not run under a partisan label, were Republican. But when a good man was running, on a nonpartisan basis, even though he was a Democrat, the voters in our community had the opportunity to select him, and they did for at least three elections.

In the District of Columbia if we have home rule legislation, we ought to have nonpartisan elections on the basis that we get a better chance to get more people who are qualified to be the mayor of a city of this size. I strongly hope that we adopt this particular amendment. Its approval will conform to not only my views but those of the House Republican policy committee.

But let me say at this point that there are other requirements, in my judgment, that must be in any bill that we approve if, so far as I am personally concerned, we are to vote for such legislation. Yes—the nonpartisan election provision; the provision concerning the automatic payments of the Federal contribution. By all means we must have an annual review by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and a final approval of the Federal financial contribution by the House and Senate as individual bodies. This provision or requirement is mandatory.

I also feel that we must have a provision that maintains the integrity of the Hatch Act. The gentleman from Minnesota has done a tremendous job in this regard. I also think we have a responsibility as a legislative body to protect the 28,000 to 30,000 employees of the District of Columbia from political pressure of any sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I cannot object to the request of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], but may I suggest to my colleagues that all of us use a little forbearance in extending the time of debate today under the 5-minute rule. Mr. Chairman, we have already extended one 5-minute period to 15 minutes, and I for one, sir, would like to go to the salubrious climate of Florida before the gentle snow falls here in Washington, and I would suggest to my colleagues not to continue asking for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, with that I could not object to the request of the able minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] having another 5 minutes at this time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, naturally I am grateful to my good friend and most able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS], and I shall try to conclude in less than 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we do have an obligation to these employees of the District of Columbia, and we must protect them from any political pressure of any sort.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we need a strong amendment that will require the listing of political contributions, their full disclosure, as well as the disclosure of expenditures by any political candidate, partisan or otherwise. I believe this to be absolutely essential to legislation of this kind.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have outlined my own views as to what I believe is necessary and essential in any legislation that we approve in this body.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Nelsen-Bell amendment, as well as amendments that would go along with the requirements that I have indicated.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support legislation that will not meet these standards.

Let me say this in closing, if I may: This is a highly emotionally charged issue. It is obvious that there are those on both sides of the issue. There are undoubtedly strong individual differences between good friends on that side of the aisle, and I can see the same is true on this side of the aisle.

I would simply like to read—because I strongly subscribe to it and I believe it is essential—the statement of the House Republican policy committee dated September 21, 1965. It starts out and says, and I quote:

> Historically and traditionally Republicans are in favor of self-government and municipal home rule. We recognize, however, that the Nation's Capital is not just another city. It is the seat of our Government.

The statement goes on with other comments and indicates that the essentials of any home rule bill would include a nonpartisan election, protection under the Hatch Act, protection of the District of Columbia employees, the absolute essentiality of an annual review of the budget of the District of Columbia by the House and the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I believe these requirements are essential for any legislation we pass here today, tomorrow or in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that the Bell-Nelsen amendment is agreed to because this is one of those mandatory requirements in any home rule legislation. If this amendment and the other requirements are met I intend to support the legislation.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and to disagree with my colleague on the question of partisan versus nonpartisan elections for the District of Columbia.

I am opposed to the proposed amendment, which would put in this bill a requirement that all elections in the future in the District of Columbia be held on a nonpartisan basis.

I was interested in the parallel the gentleman attempted to draw between the District of Columbia and other major cities of this country which he mentioned. This is a comparison which certainly falls very short when we are talking about the political structuring of the District of Columbia as opposed to a city like the city of Detroit. It is true, we have nonpartisan elections for the major and members of the common council, but every citizen of the city is encouraged to participate in the life of the political system—which to me is the two-party system—by the fact that he votes in elections for members of the State legislature

on a partisan basis; for Representatives in the Congress and the Senate of the United States in partisan elections; and for Governor, secretary of state, attorney general, and other State officials on partisan tickets. So he has a feeling at all times of being a part of the political system; and even if a person lives in the rural part of that State, he has the same feeling when he votes to elect county officials.

I am delighted that after so many years we now have the opportunity to fulfill pledges of our parties and give to the residents of the District the home rule that they have so overwhelmingly demonstrated they want and need.

I am opposed to the proposed amendment that would modify this bill and require that elections under it be nonpartisan. There are several reasons.

In the first place, a requirement for nonpartisan elections would impose on the citizens of the District the need for a completely new set of political organizations, which would have to spring up virtually full blown in the space of only a very few months—before the primary elections in May 1966. We must all recognize that nonpartisan elections do not mean that there will not be political groupings, and I am sure highly organized political groupings. "Nonpartisan" means no more than that the political groupings to which names like "Republican" and "Democrat" are attached are to be prohibited.

Today in the District there is political organization along the traditional lines of Republican and Democrat. These organizations can be expected to function to bring out the best possible candidates for the municipal positions which the bill creates. They can be expected to give direction and coherence to the political campaigns that will take place under this act. I think we would do a great deal of damage and very little good if we were now to deprive the citizens of the District of the benefit of these organizations.

Let me remind the Members of the House, as other speakers have done, that we are not by this bill deciding on the form of municipal government in the District for all time to come. In the event partisan elections produce the evils that are cited by the proponents of this amendment, we can require a change. But we can do that later, after there has been experience and after a functioning District government has been created, so that the new organizations which nonpartisan elections would require would not have to come into being at the same time that District citizens were wrestling with all of the other problems of getting their government underway.

I do not contend, of course, the nonpartisan elections in municipal governments are evil. They exist and they function with success in many cities, but by the same token I do not in any way concede that partisan elections in municipal governments are necessarily wicked. Many of our great cities as well as many of our smaller ones function successfully with partisan elections. Indeed, studies have shown that voter participation in municipal elections—and we want, of course, to encourage the greatest participation—is substantially higher in municipal elections on a partisan basis.

Politics should not be taken out of government. Indeed, it is a misconception of both politics and government when there is an attempt to so sterilize the local situation. As an observer of elections in large cities, it is readily apparent that the party affiliation of the individual candidates is generally known and often plays an important role. Indeed, often the candidate for mayor of a large city in a nonpartisan election has in the past held partisan office as a member of the State legislature, a county official, or a Member of Congress, so that the nonpartisan nature of the election is more a fiction than a reality.

On the other hand, the pretense of nonpartisanship often weakens the city executive in relation to the political machinery of his State and the Nation. It would seem particularly appropriate that in a strong mayor-council system that partisan elections would be desirable. In such a system the mayor needs to be a political leader and particularly here in the District of Columbia in many matters the mayor would be dealing directly with State Governors and nonpartisanship is not a characteristic of Governors.

I suppose it is obvious that partisan elections as provided in the bill do not preclude independent candidates who may not wish to run on a partisan ticket. The bill expressly provides for independent candidates for the municipal offices to be on the ballot in the general election along with the candidate nominated by the Republican Democratic or any other political party.

No more am I persuaded by the argument advanced in support of this amendment that it will eliminate all problems under the Hatch Act. It is true that partisan elections is expressly permitted by section 18 of the Hatch Act, and that on the surface, perhaps, all Hatch Act difficulties would disappear. But let us not fool ourselves into thinking that in a city as oriented to political thinking and political life as the District a nonpartisan candidate would not be known as a nonpartisan Republican or a Democrat, and that inevitably—and I submit properly—the nonpartisan political groupings would immediately become recognized as but another name for existing political philosophies.

In my judgment we do better to recognize, as the bill does now, the values to be gained by permitting the limited participation of Government employees in these municipal elections. These elections will occur only in nonpresidential election years, so that separation of activities in connection with municipal elections from any in connection with national elections will be simple. The fundamental protections contained in both the Hatch Act and the criminal code against solicitation by one employee for another or in Government buildings, or the use of political pressure to secure or to reward contributions, and all such matters, will continue. The bill will simply permit Federal employees in these off-year municipal campaigns to take their part as important and concerned citizens of the District, and participate in rallies, street parades, make speeches for their preferred candidates, and in other ways conduct themselves as the responsible District citizens they are.

This is not a radical proposal, and it is not the end of the merit system or of the Hatch Act. It is simply a small gesture toward Government employees who live in the District and who, I am sure, would welcome the opportunity to participate in these ordinary and usual ways in the political campaigns that will take place as a result of this bill.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words and ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to use a few extra minutes, if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] will not interpose an objection. I have used very little time on this floor in this session of Congress and I would respectfully ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, making a total of 10 minutes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and again, I shall not object, but I wonder if other members of the committee feel the same way I do, that surely we ought to have some kind of understanding that we will not keep on extending the 5 minutes under the rule.

So, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection and just hope someone else will express his opinion in regard thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota that he be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I well remember one of the most colorful speeches I ever heard on this floor was by Mr. Barden, who was referring to a bill before us for consideration. He said:

> I am reminded of the farmer who drove into the oil station with his old Model T Ford. The attendant in the oil station said "Mister, I think you ought to jack up the radiator cap and run a new car under it."

With all the confusion we have seen on the floor in reference to procedure, I agree that the Sisk amendment has the most merit of any we have heard so far. But I have an obligation to do everything I can to make the Multer bill a better bill. We have heard a good deal of discussion about the fact that we want the local people to have the right to engage in some participation in local government. By the amendment that has been proposed the elections would be on a nonpartisan basis, and under the law of the land the Civil Service Commissioner may now permit activity in any nonpartisan elections by a Federal employee.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. The gentleman referred to the Sisk bill. What possible assurance can the gentleman have that you would not end up with partisan elections, since my colleague from Maryland has already said there are people in the District who want this?

Mr. NELSEN. The Congress will have a chance to review the election procedure set up by the Charter Commission.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I want to compliment again the gentleman from Minnesota, but I would like to make it crystal clear if these requirements I have previously enumerated are included, I intend to vote for the Multer bill, but I will not vote for a bill that does not have them.

Mr. NELSEN. When you bring up a bill that promotes elections in the District of Columbia, then changing the Hatch Act under which we operate, you are then legalizing the solicitation of funds from a Federal employee.

I would like to refer to the editorial in the Evening Star in which they say that the partisan label does not discourage partisan political activity at the local level. It only masks it.

I agree with that, but the Star forgets that the main purpose of my activity in this regard is to stop the illegal solicitation of funds from Federal employees which is going on right now, and would be legalized by the language in the Multer bill.

I would like to again emphasize the need for this type of protection as an amendment to the Multer bill. I am very sorry I got very little support in the committee. I got very little support from the proponents of this bill up to now, but I suspect this is to sweeten the bill in the hope it can be passed. I have every right to fear what will happen in conference. I feel that I have a duty to do everything I can to stop the procedure that has been going on in this city, that has been investigated by the FBI, it has been investigated by the Department of Justice, but no punishment has been meted out. As a result, more and more violations occur, and more and more Federal employees are being taken for a political contribution which I do not think they should be subjected to.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WAGGONNER), there were—ayes 63, noes 70.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BELL and Mr. SICKLES.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 123, noes 114.

So the amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HAYS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS moves that the Committee now do rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the most logical and sensible thing we can do at this point is to send this bill back from whence it came.

What has happened? We are here under a discharge petition to bring a bill before the House which the very sponsor of the bill has abandoned. He has brought in a substitute of doubtful legitimacy.

They have admitted—the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]—that they do not know what is in the bill. God knows who wrote it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] do not know its parentage. It is as illegitimate as it can be.

Now we see the spectacle of the chief proponent of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], walking through the line to bring about a nonpartisan election, an election which he was arguing vociferously against as late as yesterday and the day before at lunch.

Why? Who wants this bill so bad that they are willing to throw the baby out in the cold and take in an orphan that nobody knows where it came from?

Not only that, we are here amending two different bills at the same time. And I doubt if anybody knows, most of the time, which amendment he is voting on to what bill.

We have a pledge to bring up a bill, and I would like to see an orderly bill brought up, something on the order of the Sisk compromise. But let me say to you, the big argument they are making in the cloakroom against the Sisk bill is that it is a stall, that nothing will happen, that it will go over to the next Congress. That does not need to necessarily happen. They can go back to the committee and they can come in with the Sisk bill and they can put definite time limitations in it, or we can amend it to do it—90 days to hold an election, 60 days for the charter commission, 60 days for an election, and 60 days for Congress to approve or disapprove. We can get it all done in the next session of Congress.

No, that is not what they want. The people, the small minority—and I say to you it is a small minority of the people in this District—who are fighting for home rule are the special interests who want to manipulate this city to their own ends, who want home rule for the purpose of getting by with less taxes and more Federal contribution.

I have always been for a substantial Federal contribution. I voted against appropriations of the committee on occasion because I thought the appropriations were too low.

But we have here the special interests who want to take the Nation's Capital and wring it out for every dime they can get out of it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] made the statement yesterday—and I repeat it—that they voted by a thunderous vote in favor of home rule. A total of 80,000, out of 800,000, cast a vote at all. That shows how interested the people are in home rule.

Oh, yes, everybody knows—you can hear it out in the cloakroom—whose bill this is. I do not want to name them one by one. I will be kind and put them together and say the vested interests, those who have an opportunity to make some money, to make a pecuniary gain. That is what they are after, a profit. They want to get it from the taxpayers, from the Congress, from the tourists, from everybody else. They want to turn the Nation's Capital into a paradise for the entrepreneurs, and that is a kind term for them. Back in Ohio we call them the shakedown artists.

That is what this bill is about, and it is cloaked in the fine terms of democracy and home rule and what have you.

I know I am not going to be very popular with some people for saying this, but somebody ought to say it. It is true that some will vote for it because they feel they have to, not because they want to. They know what I am saying is the truth.

There is another thing I wanted to have an opportunity to vote for, but I am willing to forgo that. That is the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, which was going to put the nonvoting delegate over in the other body. That is where he ought to be, because they talk a lot and do nothing and he is only going to have the right to talk and not to vote. That is where they ought to put him in the first place. But in this poor, little, illegitimate bill that was brought in here they forgot about that, because they were trying to sweeten it up to get enough votes to do what the proponents said. Mr. MULTER was honest there. He said the reason why we did it was this—and I am quoting again, as I did yesterday, the newspapers—we made a hardheaded count and we found we did not have the votes. No, Mr. MULTER, you did not have the votes and if the Members could vote without pressure you will never have the votes.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to match wits with the gentleman from Ohio who preceded me on the matter of illegitimacy. I do not think I have the knowledge or the experience with which to meet that kind of an argument.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. No; I will not. We have seen a lot of shadow boxing and

heard a lot of shocking camouflage dragged across the trail of the debate here. The worst of it you heard a few moments ago. Previously you heard that this is not a civil rights bill—it only deals with voting rights. Now we are told it is the vested interests that want all of this money from the Federal Treasury given to the District of Columbia and all the taxpayers of the country are going to rise up in arms because they object to paying part of the cost of maintaining the government of the District of Columbia.

No one has objected all through the years when year after year we have appropriated money for the various Federal installations in the District of Columbia. Not one voice has been heard against the appropriations year after year made directly to the District government. This year there was $50 million appropriated by this Congress to the District of Columbia to help it to maintain its government. Because we have in this bill a provision limiting the authorization with the right of the Congress to appropriate every dollar it is no good. We have met now every objection from both sides, with one exception—and an amendment will be offered to cover that. Whether the gentleman from Ohio likes it or not I will stand on this floor and say it is a good amendment and we will take it—and I hope that the House will take it and then we really have got a truly bipartisan measure for this House, which should pass and I hope it will pass despite all of the nonsense you have heard. Mind you, watch the votes. Watch who stands up on the division votes. Watch who goes down the aisle on the teller votes and on every good amendment, every implacable foe of home rule for the District, everyone who wants to see nobody in the District of Columbia, no citizen, voting for an elected mayor or elected council, they are the ones who vote to gut the bill. They are the ones who vote against the good amendments to make the bill better. They are the ones who will vote for this Sisk referendum on a referendum with an election and another referendum and another vote by Congress, which they hope will never come to pass. If you want to kill this home rule bill, vote for the Sisk amendment. If you want home rule, then perfect the Multer amendment and then pass it.

Now I beg of you, vote down the preferential motion. Let us get on with this business and finally restore to the District of Columbia—I emphasize—restore to the people of the District of Columbia the right to govern themselves as we give the right to everybody else and to every citizen of the United States. That is the least we can give to them. Let us do it and do it now.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. The gentleman used my name.

Mr. MULTER. I referred to the gentleman's amendment but otherwise did not use his name.

Mr. UDALL. The charge has been made over and over again of vested interests and of all the charges made that is the one that ought not to be made. Everyone knows who is running this city now. A cozy little arrangement between the board of trade and the big business people who like low taxes and do not want decent schools and decent welfare services in this city and a small group on the District of Columbia Committee. That is the group that runs this city. When you say turn over to the people this right and let them run it like the people in the cities all over the country have the right to, then they say you are turning it over to a small little group. Let the American citizens and the inhabitants of the District who live here and do not have any chance to say what kind of schools or government they should have, let them have the right to decide.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the preferential motion be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HAYS and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 144, noes 140.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4644) to provide an elected Mayor, City Council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 179, nays 219, answered "present" 2, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

YEAS—179

Abbitt	Bow	Clark
Abernethy	Bray	Clausen, Don H.
Adair	Brock	Clawson, Del
Andrews, Glenn	Brooks	Collier
Arends	Broyhill, N.C.	Cooley
Ashbrook	Broyhill, Va.	Cramer
Ashmore	Buchanan	Cunningham
Ayres	Burleson	Curtin
Baring	Burton, Utah	Curtis
Bates	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Battin	Cabell	Davis, Ga.
Beckworth	Callaway	Davis, Wis.
Belcher	Carter	de la Garza
Bennett	Casey	Derwinski
Berry	Cederberg	Devine
Betts	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Bonner	Chelf	Dole
Dorn	Kelly	Reinecke
Dowdy	King, N.Y.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Downing	Kirwan	Roberts
Duncan, Tenn.	Kornegay	Rogers, Fla.
Edwards, Ala.	Kunkel	Rogers, Tex.
Erlenborn	Laird	Roudebush
Everett	Landrum	Rumsfeld
Evins, Tenn.	Langen	Satterfield
Findley	Latta	Schneebeli
Fino	Lennon	Selden
Fisher	Lipscomb	Sikes
Flynt	McCulloch	Skubitz
Fogarty	McDade	Smith, Calif.
Fountain	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Fuqua	Macdonald	Springer
Gathings	MacGregor	Stanton
Gettys	Machen	Steed
Gross	Marsh	Stephens
Grover	Martin, Ala.	Stubblefield
Gubser	Martin, Mass.	Talcott
Gurney	Martin, Nebr.	Taylor
Hagan, Ga.	Matthews	Teague, Tex.
Haley	May	Thompson, Tex.
Hall	Mills	Thomson, Wis.
Halleck	Minshall	Tuck
Hansen, Idaho	Moeller	Tuten
Harris	Moore	Utt
Harsha	Morris	Waggonner
Harvey, Ind.	Murray	Walker, Miss.
Hays	Natcher	Walker, N. Mex.
Hébert	Nelsen	Watkins
Henderson	O'Konski	Watson
Herlong	O'Neal, Ga.	Watts
Hull	Passman	Whalley
Hutchinson	Pike	White, Idaho
Ichord	Pirnie	Whitener
Jarman	Poage	Whitten
Jennings	Poff	Williams
Johnson, Pa.	Pool	Wilson, Bob
Jonas	Purcell	Young
Jones, Ala.	Quillen	Younger
Jones, Mo.	Randall	
Keith	Reid, Ill.	

NAYS—219

Adams	Farnsley	McClory
Addabbo	Farnum	McDowell
Albert	Fascell	McFall
Anderson, Tenn.	Feighan	McGrath
Andrews, N. Dak.	Foley	McVicker
Annunzio	Ford, Gerald R.	Mackay
Ashley	Ford, William D.	Mackie
Baldwin	Fraser	Madden
Bandstra	Friedel	Mahon
Barrett	Fulton, Pa.	Mathias
Bell	Fulton, Tenn.	Matsunaga
Bingham	Gallagher	Meeds
Blatnik	Giaimo	Miller
Boggs	Gibbons	Minish
Boland	Gilbert	Mink
Bolling	Gilligan	Monagan
Brademas	Gonzalez	Moorhead
Broomfield	Grabowski	Morgan
Brown, Calif.	Gray	Morrison
Burke	Green, Oreg.	Morse
Burton, Calif.	Green, Pa.	Morton
Byrne, Pa.	Greigg	Mosher
Cahill	Grider	Moss
Callan	Griffin	Multer
Cameron	Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.
Carey	Hagen, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.
Celler	Halpern	Nedzi
Cleveland	Hamilton	Nix
Clevenger	Hanley	O'Brien
Cohelan	Hanna	O'Hara, Ill.
Conable	Hansen, Iowa	O'Hara, Mich.
Conte	Harvey, Mich.	Olsen, Mont.
Conyers	Hathaway	Olson, Minn.
Corbett	Hawkins	O'Neill, Mass.
Corman	Hechler	Ottinger
Craley	Helstoski	Patten
Culver	Hicks	Pelly
Daniels	Holland	Pepper
Dawson	Howard	Perkins
Delaney	Hungate	Philbin
Dent	Huot	Pickle
Denton	Irwin	Powell
Diggs	Jacobs	Price
Dingell	Joelson	Pucinski
Donohue	Johnson, Calif.	Quie
Dow	Karsten	Race
Dulski	Karth	Redlin
Duncan, Oreg.	Kastenmeier	Reid, N.Y.
Dwyer	Kee	Reifel
Dyal	King, Calif.	Resnick
Edmondson	King, Utah	Reuss
Edwards, Calif.	Kluczynski	Rhodes, Pa.
Ellsworth	Krebs	Rivers, Alaska
Evans, Colo.	Leggett	Robison
Fallon	Long, Md.	Rodino
Farbstein	Love	Rogers, Colo.
	McCarthy	Ronan
		Rooney, N.Y.

Rooney, Pa.	Sisk	Van Deerlin
Rosenthal	Slack	Vanik
Rostenkowski	Smith, Iowa	Vigorito
Roush	Smith, N.Y.	Vivian
Roybal	Stafford	Weltner
Ryan	Staggers	White, Tex.
St Germain	Stalbaum	Widnall
St. Onge	Stratton	Wilson,
Scheuer	Sullivan	Charles H.
Schisler	Sweeney	Wolff
Schmidhauser	Teague, Calif.	Wright
Schweiker	Tenzer	Wyatt
Secrest	Todd	Wydler
Senner	Trimble	Yates
Shipley	Tunney	Zablocki
Shriver	Udall	
Sickles	Ullman	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Garmatz Keogh

NOT VOTING—32

Anderson, Ill.	Hardy	Patman
Andrews,	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
George W.	Horton	Roncalio
Aspinall	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Bolton	Johnson, Okla.	Saylor
Colmer	Lindsay	Scott
Daddario	Long, La.	Thomas
Flood	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Toll
Goodell	Michel	Tupper
Hansen, Wash.	Mize	Willis

So the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union that the enacting clause be stricken out was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. POOL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who, if he were here, would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 4644.

When the Committee rose there was pending a substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] for the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, in order to expedite the business of the House—and after some 3 days of debate it seems to me the time has come to move along—I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Sisk amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. It is my understanding that there is one amendment at the desk to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY] and as part of my unanimous-consent request, I ask unanimous consent that 3 minutes of that time be reserved to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I indicated to the gentleman from California that I would be glad to join in such a request as soon as we found out how many Members still want to speak on the Sisk amendment. I understand his request was addressed only to the Sisk amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as part of my reservation of the right to object, may I propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to be offered to the Multer amendment. Would that come out of the time reserved for the closing of debate on the Sisk amendment, if that is offered—in other words, if someone offers an amendment to the Multer amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that as the Chair understood the request of the gentleman from California, it was that all debate on the Sisk substitute and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that, therefore, would not preclude the offering of any amendments to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, as part of my reservation of the right to object, I suggest that the gentleman from California ask unanimous consent for the closing of debate in 30 minutes, and I shall not object.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I revise my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Sisk substitute and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is obvious that the Members have reached some agreement over there among themselves, Members who evidently have been working on this bill at great length. The thought occurs to me that we are now setting a dangerous precedent whereby we gag Members and cut off debate on all legitimate amendments that might follow.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] will assure the members of the Committee, since the gentleman controls as he does his own substitute amendment and amendments thereto, that it is not his intention to use this device for the balance of the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, under the gentleman's reservation let me say that I have no intention of cutting anyone off. I certainly would not want to preclude any amendment that might be offered. I simply am making this request in order to expedite the consideration of this legislation. I did not realize there were so many who might want to offer amendments. I am only trying to arrive at some reasonable time when we can vote and I feel that the span of 30 minutes on this particular substitute would probably be adequate, as I understood there was only one amendment at the desk.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to the Multer substitute. Would it be in order to offer this amendment to the Multer substitute during the 30 minutes, or will it be necessary to wait until after the 30 minutes have expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Michigan that he might take either course.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And, if I offer it during the 30-minute period, however, I would not be allowed the usual 5 minutes during which to explain the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would undertake to divide the 30 minutes rather equitably.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRALEY

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRALEY to the amendment offered by Mr. SISK: Page 3, line 4, after the word "approved", strike out "a majority of the registered voters must vote in the referendum and".

Mr. CRALEY. Mr. Chairman, if we are sincere in our support of the Sisk amendment we will support my amendment removing the qualification that a majority of the registered voters must vote in the referendum. Academically and in theory this is good, but in practice it does not work. It imposes additional problems on the voters. The opposition can sit at home and rely on the impetus of those who are in favor of home rule.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRALEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I agree with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is entirely proper, and I am very willing to accept his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRALEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very unhappy that I must stand here for the brief time allotted me and speak for this painfully brief moment not having had an opportunity to speak out strongly against this incredible amendment authorizing nonpartisan elections, if they can be called elections, at that. For this great House—whose foundation is the two-party system—to tack this antiparty election amendment onto the home rule bill for the District of Columbia is to go contrary to the essence of our democracy. The nonpartisan movement is contrary to the basic principles of the democratic form of government because it denies the system of checks and balances of advocate and critic, which are essential to our democracy. This amendment is nothing less than retrogression—a step back from constitutional democracy.

This obvious appeasement by the fragmented leadership on the home rule bill would indicate that they condone the use by those on the other side of the aisle of the nonrepresentative form of government in a desperate effort to worm their way back into the mainstream.

Let me state very clearly that I signed the discharge petition to bring the home rule bill to the floor so that the House could work its will.

Mr. Chairman, I am sadly disappointed and hurt at the sight of the home rule leaders' total inability to agree on a home rule bill and even disagreeing among themselves on the floor. When they gut the basic bill to obtain votes, then perhaps basic principles are being sacrificed for political expediency.

I recognize that the art of politics is the art of compromise but you do not sacrifice the shirt off your back just to get an empty shell.

I know what type of home rule bill I supported. I thought that this was the same bill they wanted too; the same one we discharged from the District Committee. But I learned a lesson today here on the floor and the lesson is that I will never again sign a discharge petition unless it is made inalterably clear that the bill to be discharged is the same bill which we will debate and vote on when it reaches the floor.

It was a great victory for we home rule supporters when the discharge petition succeeded. It was not a victory, not even a near miss when this measure was compromised so badly and then kicked in the teeth with the antiparty election clause.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot in good conscience—not as a dedicated two-party supporter and not as a Congressman dedicated to a real home rule bill for the District—I cannot vote for these rag-tag measures. They should go back to committee where major repairs can be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is obvious in view of the fact we insist on using the route of the discharge petition on very serious legislation of this kind, and when it appears no one really knows what is in the legislation we are considering, whether it is a bill that came out through the discharge petition route, the Sisk substitute, or the Multer substitute, as amended, I ask unanimous consent that after all debate on this legislation is completed, no vote be taken for 5 legislative days, so that all Members may have a chance to find out what is in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I could hardly believe my ears when I heard the minority leader get up here and tell us about the perils and evils of partisan politics. It strikes me as particularly cynical that the leader of a great party should stand before us and tell us that there is something corrosive or corrupt or sinister about partisan politics.

We were all elected by partisan politics, and I will yield to any gentleman who wants to get up here and tell me he has been corrupted, or made less effective, by running on a party ticket.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Sisk substitute for the bipartisan amendment offered is the best thing that has come before this Committee in connection with this bill. I doubt there is 5 percent of the Members of the House including the bipartisan group that is supporting the bill who have even read it and certainly they cannot explain it.

Actually this is an attempt to write a charter or a constitution for the city-State that is to be established here by the bill.

I can think of only one reason to vote against the Sisk substitute and that would be that you consider the people of the District of Columbia so stupid that they cannot draw up a charter of their own, and that Congress has to do it for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sisk amendment. I think this House has been in session so long that many of us are becoming stir crazy. We have arrived at the silly season. Certainly the best that can be said for the Multer bill is that it is a can of worms and it needs sober and sound study; nobody is really aware of all the oversights in it and all the problems it will create.

The Sisk substitute will provide adequate time for a charter committee to reflect in a proper attitude upon the ramifications of this legislation. It will give the people of the District an opportunity to determine if they really desire home rule and it will provide the Congress an opportunity to review the legislation under much more favorable circumstances.

Again I would urge that we approve the Sisk substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to address a few words to those who truly favor home rule who might be tempted to vote for the Sisk amendment. Of course, all those who are opposed to home rule will vote for the Sisk amendment. But there may be some supporters of home rule for the District who are impressed by the argument of the distinguished sponsor of this amendment that it will provide an orderly approach to home rule.

To these Members, I should like to make just one point: If the two referendums are gone through and the charter commission is elected and comes back here to the Congress with a proposed charter for approval, that charter has to be accepted or voted down; it cannot be amended one iota by the Congress.

I ask you who are friends of home rule, What would be the chance of adoption of home rule under circumstances of that kind? After what we have seen the last 3 days in the form of ingenious attack, distortion, and diversion, it simply would not seem conceivable that a charter drawn up by an elected commission could survive in this House.

While I certainly do not question the sincerity of the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], for whom I have the greatest respect, I believe that most of those who will vote for his amendment will do so as an effort to kill home rule. So I hope no friend of home rule will vote for this amendment.

If this amendment prevails, I shall reluctantly vote for the bill and I shall devoutly hope to be proven wrong in my prediction as to what will come of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon yielded her time to Mr. ALBERT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MACGREGOR yielded his time to Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NELSEN yielded his time to Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen for the time. I have been preparing myself for a couple of days to give a lengthy dissertation on the matter of home rule. Actually, many comments have been made before the

House about the fact that support for the Sisk proposal is designed to kill the measure. Nothing could be further from the truth. I cannot determine the motives of other Members of the Congress. I do, however, want to make it abundantly clear. I am for home rule and the right for people to establish a unit of government that will be responsive to their wishes. So, I would like to put this matter in proper perspective in the amount of time I have available.

This is not a question of whether you are for or against home rule. In my judgment, it is a question of what type of home rule you are for. Do you want the Congress to tell the people of the District what they are supposed to accept or do you want the people themselves to have the opportunity to formulate their own system of government and then ratify it?

I have served in local government in California for a number of years. I attended the first home rule congress of the National Association of Counties in New York a few years ago. I can tell you that there are many people who have some strong ideas on how home rule should be handled.

The Multer proposal that is before us has been referred to as a can of worms. With the rejection of his original bill and the amending on the floor today, I doubt very much if the Members know fully what is before them in the way of a home rule proposal.

So far as I am concerned, the Sisk proposal will provide the people of the District of Columbia with the maximum opportunity to express themselves on a matter of vital concern to them, the right to determine the form of government they are desirous of having.

In California, under enabling legislation, we have this opportunity which the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] has spoken about. We would present the matter of home rule to the people. The people themselves would actually elect a board of freeholders. The board of freeholders would then prepare the charter or a local constitution, call it what you will. Once that charter or constitution has been prepared, it would be brought back to the people themselves for ratification.

We talk about home rule. The Sisk proposal would give the people of the District an opportunity on two occasions to have their say as to what type of government they desire, rather than having something shoved down their throats.

In the first place, in the proposed charter, the people could have anything that they desire. As I said on the floor yesterday, we can have a nonpartisan or a partisan election. I happen to hold the view that we should have had nonpartisan elections at the local level and then partisan elections at the State and Federal levels. It has been my experience that many people who are actually trained at the local level, irrespective of partisanship, are judged on the basis of how objective they really are, not on the basis of partisanship at the local level. This is one of the reasons, in my judgment, we have progressive local government in California. I would dare anyone to challenge the quality of local government we have out there. As far as Republicans or Democrats are concerned, they jointly support this approach, as does every progressive community and State in the Nation. I urge you to support the Sisk amendment and then bring in experts in the field of municipal government to assist the locally elected board of freeholders in developing a model government that will maximize the exercise of individual rights and at the same time assume their community responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, many people are attempting to place the Members of Congress in two camps, either for or against home rule. Let me say at the outset, nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. SISK and I have conscientiously tried, on a bipartisan basis, to offer what we think is the most objective and constructive proposal before the House.

The issue is not whether you are for or against home rule. It is a question of what type of home rule you have.

While I have not yet decided whether to vote for the Multer home rule bill, I am frank to say that I have reservations about the adequacy of the legislation toward meeting what I determine to be proper home rule.

I have long advocated home rule and strengthening of local government throughout the Nation that guarantees the maximum in participation of the electorate. It has further been my position to do everything possible to extend rights to individuals so as to hold them responsible for their actions. Rights and responsibilities go hand in hand.

Therefore, it is for this reason that I have been cooperating with Congressman SISK, of Fresno, Calif., in promoting the so-called local option type of home rule legislation. There are many reasons why I feel this to be the better measure. The first being that it parallels the very successful enabling statutes of the State of California. We often refer to it as permissive legislation. In my judgment, this is truly home rule and not something that is handed down on take it or leave it basis.

Here in the District of Columbia, we do have a somewhat different situation, inasmuch as this is the Nation's Capital. Section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States states explicitly that the Congress shall have the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District—not exceeding 10 miles square—as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of the Congress, become the seat of government of the United States." Consequently, whatever proposal is made, the Congress must take into consideration its obligations under the Constitution.

Having served for many years in local government, I felt constrained to sign the discharge petition because of my strong feeling toward providing adequate home rule. However, in discussing the legislation with many Members of the Congress, I concluded that the Sisk proposal was more in keeping with what I classify as "proper" home rule. Further, I am very much concerned about repealing certain sections of the Hatch Act to permit Federal employees to participate in the elections, where, again, a properly drawn charter, as suggested in the Sisk proposal, would establish a local nonpartisan unit of government and thereby eliminate the necessity of disturbing the well-established Hatch Act.

Having participated very extensively in local government through the County Supervisors' Association of California, I believe our nonpartisan local government concept has permitted our State to enjoy one of the most progressive systems of local government throughout the Nation.

The Sisk proposal would provide for a referendum that would permit the people of the District of Columbia to elect a board of freeholders. The board would then be granted the opportunity to draft a local charter—local constitution—that would reflect the type of government desired by the regularly elected freeholders. Once the charter is prepared, it then is voted upon and approved by the people of the District of Columbia. In this way, the people themselves have two opportunities to express themselves regarding home rule. First, in the selection of the people who draft the charter and second in the approval of the charter.

I do not think it is fair to subject these fine employees to the inevitable harassment for partisan political purposes. We want to improve the District's unit of government—not establish by legislation, a spoils system.

In San Francisco, for example, cosmopolitan charter adopted with provisions for amendment.

Our prime objective must be to establish a unit of government that guarantees a line of communication between the electorate and its governing body that will guarantee the maximum in the exercise of individual rights and the full assumption of community responsibilities.

Under our proposal the District can have—

First. Nonpartisan elections.

Second. A partisan election for Delegate.

Third. Participation in national election.

Fourth. An elected school board.

Fifth. Could be subjected to impacted area assistance for schools.

Sixth. Elected or appointed board of education.

Seventh. A split police authority if necessary.

Eighth. You can set up a property tax equalization formula.

Ninth. Elect board of equalization.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the letter from Mr. SISK to me spelling out his proposal.

Also, I would like to insert some facts regarding a suit pending in the U.S. district court relating to the Hatch Act. And finally, I insert the Home Rule Theme of the National Association of Counties, which I have adopted as my personal guideline as we all work to improve our great Federal system of Government.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1965.

DEAR DON: As you know, home rule will be before the House on Monday, September 27. After consideration of H.R. 4644—the discharge petition bill, I will move to substitute in its place my bill H.R. 10115, as originally introduced in July and not as reported out of committee.

Briefly, my bill would provide for the following:

1. A referendum within 100 days of enactment in which the people of the District of Columbia would decide whether or not they want home rule;

2. Simultaneously with the referendum they would vote for a 15-member, nonpartisan District of Columbia Charter Board;

3. If the home rule proposition were approved, the Charter Board would be charged with the responsibility of drafting a local self-government charter which would be submitted to the voters within 8½ months of the first referendum;

4. The charter, if approved in this second referendum, would be transmitted to Congress for its consideration. If not specifically approved earlier or rejected, it would automatically take effect at the end of 90 days.

This proposal is the type of legislation used in most States to enable a city to establish a home rule charter. Although H.R. 10115 grants the Charter Board the widest permissible latitude in framing a charter, the bill is consistent with the constitutional requirement that Congress retain ultimate legislative responsibility for the Nation's Capital. In my opinion, enactment of this legislation would provide a more practical method of securing home rule for the District of Columbia.

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the statement I made on the floor when I introduced H.R. 10115. I do hope you will give my bill your consideration and support if you feel it is justified.

Sincerely,

B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress.

SUIT PENDING IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND (CIVIL ACTION NO. 16460) RELATING TO THE HATCH ACT

FACTS

The U.S. Civil Service Commission has granted to Montgomery County, Md., residents an exemption to section 16 of the Hatch Act to engage in nonpartisan political activities or to become independent or nonpartisan candidates for office. The Civil Service Commission has uniformly, and without exception, restricted such exemptions to independent nonpartisan activities of a purely local nature. The Code of Federal Regulations (5 C.F.R. 733.301(a)), provides in effect (1) that an employee shall not engage in nonlocal partisan political activities; (2) that employees may not run as candidates for a political party or become involved in political management in connection with the campaign of a party candidate; (3) that an employee who is a candidate for local elective office shall run as an independent.

Early in 1964 parties in Montgomery County filed requests with the Civil Service Commission for an exemption for Federal employees residing in that county to participate in local partisan elections and become partisan candidates. The Commission denied the requests.

In March 1965 parties petitioned the Civil Service Commission to hold a further hearing to review the denied requests. The Commission denied this request. In April 1965 the parties filed a petition for reconsideration which petition was denied by the Commission. Thereafter the parties filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, attacking the action of the Civil Service Commission and the constitutionality of the prohibition against engaging in partisan politics.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Section 16 of the Hatch Act was born in an amendment introduced from the floor of the Senate by Senator BYRD of Virginia after consultation with Senator Hatch, during the 1940 debates on extension of the act. Senator Hatch stated, in support of the amendment: "Inasmuch as the amendment which the Senator now offers merely restores to the Civil Service Commission the power which it had and which it exercised before the passage of the (original) act last year, I thought it was wise to give general authority to meet local or domestic situation" (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2977).

Senator Hatch was referring to authority which the Civil Service Commission had exercised prior to the Hatch Act, to waive the provisions of civil service rule I, which prohibited employees in the competitive civil service from participating in political management or political campaigns. This principle had been established by President Theodore Roosevelt in Executive Order No. 642 of June 3, 1907 (exhibit B, p. 1) from which civil service rule I was derived. By subsequent Executive orders issued by Presidents Taft, Wilson, Coolidge, and Hoover the waiver was extended to various communities in Maryland and Virginia near the National Capital. All such waivers, however, incorporated a prohibition against participation in general partisan politics (see Executive Orders Nos. 1472, 1930, 4048, 5627 (exhibit B, pp. 3–7)).

In Executive Order No. 4048 of July 12, 1927, the President granted to the Civil Service Commission authority to extend the waiver to other incorporated municipalities, subject to the prohibition against partisan politics.

In the 81st Congress an amendment was introduced to the Hatch Act which would have permitted partisan political activity at the local level. The bill was vetoed by President Truman. President Truman in his veto message observed that in States where local branches of political parties are required to support State and national tickets, the principles of the Hatch Act would be violated. The historic application of the principle of Federal employees in participating in partisan political campaigns has not been changed by the Commission nor by the Congress to this date.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DEFENSE OF THE HATCH ACT

The brief filed by the Justice Department in defense of the action of the Civil Service Commission in denying local partisan participation by Federal employees clearly supports the position of those opposing the provision in the home rule bill which would exempt for the first time Federal employees from the provisions of the Hatch Act so as to permit partisan participation in elections.

In the brief at the bottom of page 25 the Justice Department states that the Supreme Court has held that complete prohibition of political participation does not violate employees' rights and, therefore, there is no question as to the right of the Commission under the Hatch Act to limit its exemptions to nonpartisan activity. "The immunization of Executive employees from partisan politics is a rational requirement which is more than justified by the vital public interest in the integrity of the career civil service."

To recognize the reasonableness of the Commission's decision to permit only nonpartisan local political activity, one need only consider the problems at which the Hatch Act was aimed and the realities of party politics as currently practiced in the United States. Party politics are not conducted in separately sealed compartments neatly labeled "local," "State," and "National." Political organizations grow from the grassroots in the precincts to the great quadrennial nominating conventions. The integrated nature of party organization is most strikingly reflected right in the name of the plaintiff political association: the "Democratic State Central Committee for Montgomery County, Md." Party workers are constantly exhorted and continuously tempted to join in putting over their party's ticket at every level of government. From the candidates' teas before the primaries to the poll watchers' coffee on election day, the politics of community, State, and Nation are inextricably linked. Local politics are the ladder which our national leaders must climb. This is both a political and an economic necessity of the party system, as any American who has ever answered a political canvasser's knock at his door can testify. Were it otherwise plaintiffs would not be here, for they could easily organize an independent Democratic or Republican Party whose interest stopped at the county line.

It is the integrated aspect of party politics which poses the great danger and the great temptation of the integrity of the Government worker. First, there is the possibility that the national political party controlling the Federal Government—be it Democrat, Republican, Whig, or Federalist—might coerce Federal employees to work for that party and its local affiliates. Such things are not unknown in American history. By barring any partisan political activity, the Commission protects the Federal employee from this possibility while providing his community with a method by which he may participate in its affairs.

Second, career civil servants must serve with equal devotion successive department heads with different views and political affiliations. If a Federal employee campaigned, even at the local level, for one national party, it could inhibit his best efforts for an administration controlled by another party, thus harming the efficiency of the executive civil service. Such a danger is avoided by a clean and clear restriction to local, nonpartisan activity, independent of any National and State affiliation.

Third, the civil service as an institution could be completely demoralized by the specter of politically linked advancement—assignment or promotion directly or indirectly influenced by support of the department head's political party. But the Commission's retention of section 9's ban on partisan politics reinforces the statute's prohibition of such conduct by making it impossible for any employee to render such support.

THEME: HOME RULE

Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake.

Strong local government is the foundation of our Republic.

DON H. CLAUSEN,
Member of Congress, First District, California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. LONG of Maryland yielded his time to Mr. ALBERT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, in 1 minute I shall not attempt to call up an amendment which I am prepared to offer to the Multer substitute. However, I believe the Members should have notice as to what the amendment will be. It may be important to some in determining how they will vote on the Sisk amendment.

While substantial progress has been made in perfecting the Multer substitute, there remains one disturbing loophole. Under that substitute, as it now stands, there would be no requirement that candidates for office or their committees file any report or accounting concerning campaign contributions or expenditures. Furthermore, there would be no restriction against corporations and labor unions making direct contributions to candidates and their political committees. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], is familiar with the text of the amendment which I shall offer. I want to say that if this amendment is adopted I plan to vote for the Multer home rule bill as amended. I wonder if the gentleman from New York will indicate at this time whether he will accept my amendment when it is offered later.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is putting his finger on an oversight which should be corrected. No one could object to it. It would extend the Corrupt Practices Act, as so many thought it should, to the District of Columbia under the charter bill. So far as I am concerned it is a good amendment and I will accept it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The text of my amendment is as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GRIFFIN to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 81 of the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MULTER (H.R. 11218) between lines 7 and 8, after section 816, add a new section 817 to read as follows:

"CAMPAIGN FINANCING

"SEC. 817. (a) Subsection (b) of section 13 of the District Election Act of 1955 is amended by inserting after the words 'a candidate for' the words 'Mayor, District Council, Board of Education, District Delegate,'.

"(b) Subsection (d) of section 13 of the District Election Act of 1955 is amended by inserting after the words 'any campaign for election of' the words: 'any Mayor, member of the District Council, member of the Board of Education, District Delegate,'.

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 13 of the District Election Act of 1955 is amended by striking the words 'within ten days after the election' and inserting in lieu thereof the words: 'not less than ten nor more than fifteen days before, and also within twenty days after any election'.

"(d) Section 13 of the District Election Act of 1955 is further amended by adding after subsection (e) a new subsection (f) to read as follows:

"'(f) The word "election" as used in this Section 13 means any election, including any primary, general or special or run-off election.'

"(e) The first paragraph of section 610 of Title 18, United States Code, is amended to add after the words 'Resident Commissioner to Congress' the words ', or any official elected under the District of Columbia Charter Act'."

Mr. GRIFFIN. To provide a more complete explanation of the need for my amendment, I shall insert in the RECORD an excellent article by the able and respected newspaper reporter, Walter Pincus, which appeared in the September 24, 1965, issue of the Washington Star:

MONEY AND POLITICS: HOME RULE BILL LOOPHOLE

(By Walter Pincus)

The District of Columbia home rule bill—as now written—contains no provisions to govern campaign financing of the elections for Mayor, City Council, and Board of Education set up by the measure.

Without specific legislative language to cover the new elective situations, District election officials believe these candidates may not be legally bound by any District campaign fund statutes now on the books.

If that is the case, District mayoralty candidates in 1966, for example, would not have to publicly report their contributions and expenditures, could receive unlimited funds from any sources—including corporations and unions—and could spend any amount on the campaign they could afford.

Even if the District statute were applicable, information filed would be useless for the 1966 voter since the reports are not required until 10 days after the election.

COULD BE COSTLY

In a sharply contested election with the District of Columbia City Hall at stake, campaigns could become costly and their financing could be an important issue.

Last year's Democratic primary provided an insight into what may be ahead. Prior to that election, there were allegations made that the Convention Democrats' slate was being financed by the late Frank Luchs of the real estate firm of Shannon & Luchs. Convention Democrats' officials—and Luchs—denied the allegations.

It was only after the election, when the reports showing a $12,000 deficit were filed, that the extent of Luchs' role become apparent. Some bills are still outstanding.

The 1964 primary campaign reports show another potential District of Columbia election financing problem. Two Democratic slates received money from District business firms—particularly liquor stores. For example, according to the filed reports the Convention Democrats received $100 from Sheriff Liquors, Inc., and the Dedmon-Gerr slate got $25 from Epstein Liquors and $25 from Kojak Liquors.

The International Electrical Workers Union was listed as giving $150 to the winning United Democrats for Johnson slate while the Dedmon group reported $50 from the Journeyman Barber Union.

Federal election laws prohibit unions and corporations from contributing to Federal elections—prohibition that would apply to the District Delegate candidates. But under present and proposed District law, such contributions would be legal in the District of Columbia Mayor's race, for example.

ISSUE NEVER RAISED

Apparently the question of campaign finance regulations for the home rule bill has never been brought up during Capitol Hill consideration of the message.

The Board of Elections, which was established by the District Primary Act, has not discussed the matter either.

"You would think the Nation's Capital would be a model for this sort of thing," a District of Columbia official said yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sisk amendment.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of the Sisk substitute amendment brushed aside yesterday the thundering support the people of the District of Columbia have repeatedly given to the principle of home rule. In 1964, for example, they voted 72,674 for, 12,106 against—more than 6 to 1 for home rule.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] yesterday questioned whether these tremendous majorities in the District of Columbia referendums for home rule really meant what they said. The gentleman asked Members, before they vote today, to get in touch with a laundry, to contact a drycleaning place, to drop in at a department store, and to ask those citizens what they think of home rule.

Mr. Chairman, we have adopted the Whitener formula.

We contacted Lee's Hand Laundry, 2604 Connecticut Avenue NW., and asked its proprietor, Mrs. George W. Mathis, what she thought of home rule. She said:

I'm in favor of it. It's better for the people and better for the city.

Then we tried a drycleaning shop, the Bon-Sha Valet Shop, 924 14th Street NW., and asked its proprietor, Mr. Bressler, how he stood:

Home rule will be good for business, and it will be good for those who live in the District.

Then we tried John Daws, clerk at Woodward & Lothrop, who says:

People ought to be allowed to elect their own officials.

I urge the rejection of the Sisk amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in the judgment of this Member—and I have worked on home rule from the first month I came to the Congress—the Sisk amendment, while sponsored by a gentleman who is sincere and honest and believes in home rule, is a one-way ticket to the cemetery for home rule, and I hope it will be rejected.

It is passing strange to me that those who support this amendment are the same ones who say that we in the Congress ought to write District law, and are against home rule.

Today we have an opportunity to write a charter for the District, rather than to turn the matter over to the local people, of whom they are afraid, to have the local people write a charter. We can write it ourselves now, today before the sun goes down tonight, if we defeat this amendment. I hope by that time we will have written a home rule charter which will stand the test of time.

I urge the defeat of this Sisk amendment on those grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Sisk amendment. Before I decided to talk, I was fearful of the Multer amendment. It has been disclosed there was an oversight. I wonder

how many other oversights there may be in the Multer proposal.

Mr. Chairman, the first imposition of home rule upon Washington, D.C., ended in failure and disaster 87 years ago.

Nevertheless, for several decades, certain Members of Congress have been again trying to impose local government upon District citizens. Their objectives and motives vary widely. A small cadre of petty, but aspiring Washington politicians and Federal bureaucrats have colluded with each other to enhance their political domain and develop new patronage. These few have misexploited natural and traditional desires for self-government and democracy. Their slogan "home rule now" is misleading.

None has given much consideration to the interests of the citizen of Washington. Few have given much consideration to the U.S. taxpayer. Yet these are the paramount interests.

It should be remembered that Washington is the Capital of all Americans—not just those who temporarily reside here. Most Washingtonians are transient. Almost all who reside here work for the Federal Government, or work for someone who works for the Federal Government, or they came here to obtain welfare. If the National Capital were St. Louis or Chicago, there would not be 1,000 persons living here. They knew the conditions before they arrived here.

The residents of Washington throughout the years have been treated more munificently than the citizens of any other city in the world. Taxes of all kinds are less in Washington than anywhere else in the United States. More Federal money has been poured into Washington than anywhere else in the country. The Federal taxpayer has provided more services and facilities for the District of Columbia resident than any other city could possibly afford for its own citizens. The District has the highest per capita income, probably the highest per capita crime rate, and the highest proportionate per capita welfare rate. These petty politicians want more from "Uncle Sugar."

So far the home rule schemes seem designed to get even more money to squander in the District, to acquire exorbitant political patronage, or to achieve indirect control over the Federal functions by Federal underlings and bureaucrats.

The proper perspective and correct answers would be more apparent if Members would imagine themselves as ordinary, honest citizens of Washington. Would they then want a different system of government? Perhaps they would. Every government can be improved. How would they change it or improve it? Would they expect their fellow citizens from other States, to pay their way? Of course not. Would they want the Representatives from other States, all quite different from Washington, to dictate the kind and form of government to be imposed upon them? Certainly not—that is, if they have any pride or initiative for themselves or their community.

The essence of home rule, of true self-government, is not to live under a system imposed from above, or outside, by the administration and a divided committee of Congress, but to plan, develop, and manage one's own government.

Self-government for Washington requires that the local citizens participate in the organization of their own government—rather than merely attempt to keep it functioning after someone else has attempted to put a theoretical model together—haltingly and haphazardly.

Not one proponent of home rule for Washington has had any experience in planning or developing a city of any size. The sum total of their municipal experience came from walking into an ongoing city chartered and organized many years earlier.

I can tell you we would be inviting trouble. Place yourself in the position or status of a self-sufficient citizen-taxpayer of Washington. Would you not want to participate in the organization of your new government? Of course you would. If you were the kind to disdain an opportunity to participate in the formation of your new government, you would not deserve self-government.

The most effective method; the most practical method; the method most compatible with democracy; the method which affords the most self-government; is the charter proposal by referendum of the people, by the people, and for the people?

Only those who want to impose government on others, rather than provide an opportunity of self-government, could object to a popular, local, democratic referendum.

I suggest that we do exactly what we would want if we were residents of Washington, D.C. We would want a charter committee. We would want a popular referendum. We would want the opportunity of true and complete self-government—not just the obligations to carry on a novel, insipient system of government, haphazardly concocted and furiously modified at the last minute for crude political reasons—which have little relation to the citizens of Washington.

I will vote for the Sisk substitute. If it prevails, I will vote for the bill. If it fails, I will vote "nay" on final passage, and hope that, someday soon, Members of Congress will sincerely interest themselves in the citizens of Washington.

Another point: many question the ability of Washington residents to govern themselves. They failed once. They have shown little interest in what they can contribute to the Nation's Capital—but concern themselves mostly with what they can derive from their residence here. Their principal example is the Federal Government which is laced with growing patronage, corruption, and mediocrity.

Why toss a neophyte into deep water, with only a crude support, to sink or swim? Why not permit him to start from scratch, develop slowly, grow with his own system, learn from the ground up. People take more pride, work harder, derive more satisfaction and contribute more selflessly to something of their own than something handed down to them from others.

A government formed and organized by the people, for the people, has an infinitely better chance for success and permanence than a government forced upon them no matter how it is defined or how well it was devised. None of the present proposals, other than the charter referendum proposal, has any real chance for survival, let alone success.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OTTINGER yielded his time to Mr. ALBERT.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is useless to try to teach mathematics to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] who keeps talking about the thunderous vote taken in the District last year in favor or home rule. His own figures say that 70,000 people voted for it and 18,000 against it, which means exactly 10 percent of the people voted at all, and approximately 7 percent voted for it.

Obviously the gentleman refuses to consult Webster about what the word "thunderous" means, and he continues to try to confuse the House. But the fact remains that only 7 percent of the population of this city was interested enough to go out and vote at all, and there was a terrific campaign in the newspapers to whip up sentiment for it.

Again I say to you, Mr. REUSS, that, in Wisconsin, may be thunder, but it is just pipsqueaking in Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sisk amendment. I point out to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that there is no guarantee whatever that you can get the standards or the criteria suggested by the Republican policy committee for home rule in Washington under the Sisk formula, but you do get it under the Multer bill. More than that the procedures under the Sisk formula are unnecessary, unworkable, unwise, and I believe unconstitutional. If a charter were to be written by the citizens board in the District and then come back for congressional approval, it would then have the force of law without any participation on the part of the executive branch of the Government, as required by the Constitution of the United States. I think this would clearly not pass the constitutional test. I think that the Sisk amendment is an absolute sudden death for home rule in the District and urge you—I urge you to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] for 1 minute.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, in the brief moments that are mine I would like to dwell on one point with respect to the Sisk bill because much has been made of the fact that this bill does substantially what is done in every State of the Union as far as new municipalities are concerned. A rather important element has been left out of this bill, and I

think we ought to consider that. This element is that in legislation of this kind not only in my State of Maryland but in the State of California there are guidelines so that when a municipality sets out to set up its charter it has some rules. If it stays within reasonable bounds, according to those rules, whatever it does will finally be approved by the approving authority. In the State of Maryland, as a matter of fact, we do not have any such legislative approval as long as the municipality stays within the guidelines. Then, if there are any problems, you go to the courts. Here we elect a charter board who will read this RECORD as far as guiding principles are concerned and try to guess what the answers are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, the confusion on the part of the proponents of this much amended, and very readily available for amendment, legislation is not surprising. I note with interest some of the folks who were urging the Democratic members not to vote awhile ago in the way they wanted to on this nonpartisan election business. Strangely enough, those folks are doing the bidding of the Republican chairman of the District of Columbia as he stated his position in a letter to most of us. Then these others were taking the position that the Democratic Party officials in the District of Columbia are wrong about that. So there is utter confusion, but there is not nearly so much confusion and chaos as will occur in Washington if this infamous piece of legislation should ever find its way to the White House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the confusion is not in the minds of the sponsors of home rule but in the minds of those who would like to defeat this bill and defeat it by passing the Sisk amendment. The Sisk amendment is bad for all the reasons that have already been stated plus these additional reasons: Despite the arguments made to the contrary, the law of California and the law of New York, which I have researched and cannot now expound upon, and that of most States that have home rule, have none of the prohibitions and inhibitions contained in the Sisk bill.

One of them has already been removed, that is, the requirement that a majority of the voters go to the polls. One that has not been removed prohibits the very people who know most about home rule and a charter for home rule from participating as members of the Charter Commission. These are people who are officers and employees of the District government.

Another great stumbling block which will prevent this Sisk bill ever becoming effective is the fact that it provides that two Members who approve this proposition and two who vote against it in this House to get together and agree on the language for submission to the people. All we need do is have one of those persons disagree and they will never have anything to put on the ballot.

Mr. Chairman, the Sisk amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I feel very much as though I have been through a Mixmaster. I really did not know that anyone could write a piece of legislation as bad as mine has been pictured. The only thing I can say is that I am going to talk to my good friends in the California State Legislature when I get home, because this was lifted out of the California State Code.

I should like to say to my good friends and colleagues in the House that I think this situation has been discussed long enough. I sincerely believe in this approach. I think it is an orderly approach. I think it will provide home rule for the District of Columbia in a calm atmosphere. We have seen what happens in an attempt to write a bill on the floor of the House. Amendments of all kinds have been offered—some readily agreed to—until I am wondering if anyone will know what has been done with reference to the Multer substitute.

Mr. Chairman, my approach is a sound approach. It is used throughout the Nation and I should hope the Members will examine it carefully and support it. It will provide home rule in an orderly fashion for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose any proposition offered by the distinguished gentleman from California, who is a very conscientious and constructive Member of this House. The gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] I think said that it has been charged that the Sisk amendment is designed to kill home rule. I do not make that charge, but I do believe, whether by design or accident, if we adopt the Sisk amendment we will have killed home rule because, as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] has said, if we adopt the Sisk amendment we are heading home rule for the graveyard.

I think the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] was probably slightly overstating the case when he said that we will indicate that we do not trust the District residents if we do not adopt the Sisk amendment. The truth of the matter is that if we want to turn this whole matter over to the District residents, we would simply authorize them by legislation to set up their own home rule and not have it come back to Congress where everybody in the House of Representatives and in the Senate could snipe at it.

We face here not a theory but a practical decision. The other body has passed a bill. We have in substance amended that bill; the amendments are not many and every one of the amendments is sound. I am happy to say that the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Republican Members who have worked on this have made substantial contributions.

This is the Nation's Capital. I, for one, am happy that this measure will leave the House with bipartisan support because this Nation's Capital deserves and its people deserve the support of leaders in the Congress of both of our great political parties.

I see nothing wrong with the amendments that have been offered and adopted to the Multer bill. They are strengthening amendments. I think they are helpful amendments. I think above all else it is important to remember that we have been waiting since 1949, I believe, for an opportunity to vote on home rule. We now have a bill that we can send to the Senate to which the Senate can agree or which can be sent to conference, if necessary.

Its essential elements are similar to those in the Senate bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity now to establish home rule in the District of Columbia, if we believe in it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not blame my friends who do not believe in any kind of home rule for voting for the Sisk amendment, because as has been pointed out over and over again, it represents a trip to the graveyard.

Now, my friends, it is passing strange that almost everyone——

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman used my name.

Mr. ALBERT. Not at this moment. It is passing strange that almost everyone who is going to vote against the bill will support the Sisk amendment.

Now may I say finally, Mr. Chairman, we have a commitment to democratic government in this country. We are spending billions of dollars around the world because we believe in that commitment. We believe that our system is the best and most representative system. The very heart and soul of democratic government is the right to self-government. If we deny that right to those people who live in the Capital of our land, how can we insist that others throughout this Nation and throughout the world have a right to it?

Mr. FINO. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset, I would like to make my position crystal clear. For 13 years, I have consistently supported and voted for all civil rights measures and I cannot agree with those who say that opposition to home rule reflects opposition to civil rights legislation.

In terms of abstract democratic principle, as applied to any other city in the United States, no reasonable person would deny the desirability, to say nothing of the right, of the people living in that city to rule and govern themselves.

But, to me, Washington is not just any other city. It is the District of Columbia—an area set aside by the Constitution to serve as the seat of Government for the whole United States.

Washington is not just another city—it is the Federal City—a beautiful city created as a home for the Federal Government. It is in every way dominated by the Federal Government, and if we

alter or change this relationship, we do so at our peril.

Washington must continue to be governed by Congress. The basic interest of the Federal Government in the future of this city is simply too great to cast aside a system of Government that has proved to be so satisfactory in meeting the unique needs of the Capitol.

The city cannot be removed physically from the Federal Government. No home rule government in Washington could operate effectively in either functional or physical isolation, apart from the Federal Government and independent of it.

Thus, any locally elected government providing for home rule would mean a wholly artificial separation that could bring on disastrous consequences.

Aside from the constitutional and purely practical governmental relationship between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, there are other compelling reasons why Washington must continue to be a Federal responsibility.

For example, the National Capital, by its very nature, belongs to all the people of the United States. Although the residents of Washington may have a more immediate concern in the routine, day-to-day administration of District affairs, they have no more stake in the fundamental purpose for the District, which is to serve as the seat of National Government, than do any other American citizens.

To every American from Maine to Hawaii, from Florida to Alaska, and all points in between, Washington means the White House, the Capitol, the Supreme Court, the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and so forth. Washington is, above all else, the power, the majesty, and the dignity of the Federal Government. It means these things to the American people, and for this reason it must and should continue under the jurisdiction of Congress.

We have shown that a home rule government for the District of Columbia is vulnerable from a legal and administrative point of view. We have also demonstrated that, because of both its substantive and symbolic significance, Washington belongs to the people of the United States and should remain under the control of their representatives.

An equally convincing case can be made against a local home rule government when one considers the existing and potential fiscal problems with which such a government would have to grapple.

Every major city these days is very hard pressed for funds. In Washington these financial probelms are compounded by factors that do not exist in other cities.

The worst of these problems, unique to Washington, is the tax-exempt status of so much of the real property within the District. The Federal Government itself owns more than 40 percent of the city's land area—all nontaxable, of course. The holdings of foreign governments in land, embassies, chanceries, and the like constitute another large category that is untouchable in terms of taxes. The same status applies to extensive real estate holdings that belong to the many educational, religious, and charitable organizations with headquarters here.

All in all, the District government loses more than $50 million a year because so much of the real property is beyond the reach of the tax collector. This is a fact of life with which any local government must live because nothing can be done about it.

Other cities could perhaps expand their tax base by annexing parts of their suburbs. Washington cannot do this. Or other cities might seek larger revenues by attempting to bring in new industry. Washington cannot do this either, at least not to any significant degree.

Clearly, no District government could ever hope to operate under these conditions solely on the revenues raised in the conventional way, that is, through property taxes, income taxes, sales taxes, licensing, various fees, and so forth. It would be grossly unfair to local residents and would indeed place an intolerable burden on them.

Recognizing this, the Congress has always authorized an annual appropriation from the Treasury to assist the local government in meeting its essential obligations.

The bill we have before us today proposes to substitute a formula for the wisdom and discretion of the Congress. An amendment proposed as a compromise would restore the discretion of the Congress to some extent, by retaining the formula but making it a ceiling for annual congressional appropriation rather than an automatic payment provision. This is a step in the right direction, I suppose, but I for one do not see any reason for retaining this troublesome formula as any kind of corollary to the appropriation process. I do not like the idea of a limitation on the amount of money that Congress can give to the Nation's Capital. I do not like it any more than I like the idea of the appropriations process being replaced by a formula which substitutes mathematics for congressional deliberation. The formula is an insult to the Congress, both as a substitute and as a ceiling. Not only is the formula an unnecessary hindrance to the Congress, but it sets dangerous precedents with respect to the Federal, State, and local tax relationship.

The Federal payment to the District made in lieu of taxes will also raise another problem. Local governments in the capital cities of States may also press for the same subsidies, and thus undermine the concept of tax exemption for governmental entities.

Also, the Federal payment formula will set a dangerous precedent with respect to States and localities where there are large Federal property holdings. Sometimes the Federal Government turns back a portion of Federal property revenues as payments in lieu of real and personal property taxes. But I can think of no situation where the Federal Government payment is made also in lieu of hypothetical business income and related taxes as well, and these factors are included in the Federal payment computation formula.

I believe that the Federal payment provision in this bill is unwise, and I think that it will have some dangerous effects upon our State and local tax structures. The only way that a fair payment can be made to the District—a payment which will not set a multitude of bad precedents—is if that payment is decided by the Congress based solely on an assessment of District needs. The formula is not only irrelevant to the apropriation process—it is a threat to the Federal-State-local tax relationship.

Local self-government is a cornerstone of American democracy. It is difficult for anyone who believes this, as I most certainly do, to oppose it in any form in any place in the United States.

But I must take a stand against home rule for the District.

In the first place, the undeniable legal responsibilities of Congress toward the District preclude any true home rule government here.

Second. The Federal interest, which must be the overriding consideration, is incompatible with home rule.

Third. Washington, the Nation's Capital, belongs to the people of the Nation. Those of us elected by the people must continue to be held accountable for the government of this city.

Then there are a host of valid, minor reasons for opposing home rule legislation of the sort proposed here today. Let me go into a few:

First. I understand that the District government has authority under the proposed legislation to levy a special tax without limitation of rate or amount upon all taxable real and tangible personal property in the District to pay principal and interest on District bonds and notes.

Second. I understand that the City Council of the District will be able to issue negotiable notes to meet supplemental appropriations up to 5 percent of the total budget, which strikes me a beckoning finger of local irresponsibility.

Third. Under home rule, the Congress is excluded from control or supervision of any kind over the District's budget or expenditures.

Fourth. The bill provides no assurance to District government career employees of the continuation of protection under the U.S. civil service system.

Fifth. The bill permits officials and employees of the Federal Government to be members of the District Council, with all the possibilities of conflicts of interest arising therefrom.

Sixth. There is no provision for nonpartisan local elections which is the only way to keep local elections from turning into partisan tools for extortion from civil servants with the money being funneled into the coffers of the party in power nationally. Nonpartisan elections also seem fitting to the character of the seat of the Federal Government.

Finally, the only reliable way to assure Washington of an equitable Federal payment, which it must have to survive, and at the same time not establish dangerous precedents relating to Federal

funds, is for Congress each year to consider with care and sympathy the needs of the District and appropriate funds accordingly.

I urge the Members of this House to be realistic and vote without reference to any unfortunate formula against this bill. Nothing before us today makes home rule a safe, workable concept.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, as the author of a companion measure to the home rule bill before us, and as one who believes that the right of self-government applies with equal force to the citizens of our Nation's Capital, I support the passage of H.R. 4644.

The right to participate in self-government is essential in a democratic society. This body has just this year reasserted the fundamental nature of citizen participation in government by the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We cannot continue to deny this right of participation in self-government to those who live in the District of Columbia.

The constitutional authority granted the Congress over the Nation's Capital has been repeatedly cited as a reason to oppose this measure.

Adequate historic precedent exists to support home rule. The Federal city functioned under self-government during periods in our history when the framers of our Constitution still guided the destiny of this Nation from national elective office.

The special nature of the District of Columbia as the seat of our National Government belonging to all of our citizens, has also been cited as a reason to oppose home rule.

The very fact that it is the Nation's Capital and holds a special place in the minds and hearts of all Americans requires that we grant to its citizens the rights which the people in the rest of the Nation so zealously guard as essential to that way of life of which the District of Columbia has become the symbol.

A nation founded to establish justice cannot offer less than full justice to the citizens of its Capital City.

A government which exists by the consent of the governed cannot continue to deny self-government to the people of the District of Columbia.

I support and urge the passage of H.R. 4644. The national conscience demands and justice requires home rule for the District of Columbia.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my wholehearted support to the action to restore democratic government to the District of Columbia.

Let us face the fact that the Congress of the United States is not suited to be the city council for this great community. Our forefathers justly decried, "No taxation without representation." But we have taken the taxes of the good people of Washington and given them despotism in return. Our despotism has sometimes been benevolent; sometimes as harsh as that of George III, but always it has deprived the people of Washington of the power to determine what is best for themselves.

It is outrageous that we should tell Washingtonians that they need an aquarium when they think they need schools, that we should tell them to take starving mothers off their welfare roles when they possess a sense of charity, that we should threaten them against enacting fair housing codes when they oppose racial discrimination. The people of Washington are conscious of their responsibilities as citizens and as trustees of the Federal City. I am confident that the Nation's Capital is safe in their hands because they are proud to be part of it, just as it is part of each of them.

I am thrilled at the opportunity to put an end to a system that has enabled outsiders to stamp their own social philosophy on this community, when the community manifestly and, in my view, correctly, has not wanted it. I am proud to endorse home rule for the District of Columbia and I look forward to a new birth of freedom for all of the residents of Washington.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, you have heard it charged today—as it has been repeatedly charged in the past—that Congress has been inept in its handling of the District's affairs and derelict in its duties and responsibilities to the District.

To the contrary, the House District Committee and the House Subcommittee on Appropriations handling District of Columbia appropriations, have been more than generous in their time and devotion to the District, as evidenced by and reflected in the legislative results achieved.

They have presented in the RECORD heretofore, as well as in the printed hearings on the home rule bills this year, a summary of the salient facts, citing specific examples, showing that Congress has well discharged its responsibilities to the District.

I refer to these exhibits again so that Members may be reminded of the actual facts:

First. The total Federal payment to the District of Columbia for 1965 was $112,162,000—$40 million Federal payment and $72,162,000 representing services provided by the Federal Government in the District that are essentially local in nature and not of the type made by the Federal Government elsewhere throughout the United States.

Second. Typical expenditures provided and approved by the Congress for the District of Columbia, in comparison with similar expenditures made in 17 major cities—Milwaukee, Baltimore, Pittsburgh, Boston, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Buffalo, San Francisco, Houston, St. Louis, Minneapolis, New Orleans, Dallas, San Antonio, San Diego, Seattle—of comparable size, between 500,000 and 1 million, fiscal year 1963:

First. The District ranks No. 1 per capita general expenditures—for all functions excluding capital outlay.

Second. It ranks No. 1 in per capita expenditure for police.

Third. It ranks No. 1 in per capita expenditures for health and hospitals. This computation does not even include $42 million spent by the Federal Government for hospital construction in the District, and this has no parallel in any State and arises solely because of the status of the District as the Federal City.

Fourth. It ranks No. 2 in expenditures per pupil in average daily membership for operating costs of public education. This, of course, does not include capital outlay for school construction. In that connection, I might say we have spent $75 million for 1,382 new school classrooms in the District of Columbia in the past 10 years. As far as we have been able to learn, this expenditure is greater than that spent for this purpose in any of the other 17 cities of comparable size during this period—all of which belies the frequent allegation that the Congress is indifferent to the cause of public education in the District of Columbia.

It has always seemed odd to me that when important visitors come to Washington and are shown the District's schools—or when certain Members of Congress inspect the same—the tour always is directed to the few of the older school buildings—as if to impress the visitors or the Members that these typify the District schools, which of course is far from the truth. It is like a fellow wearing his oldest and most dilapidated suit in order to arouse sympathy over his apparent poverty, when as a matter of fact he has 20 new suits hanging in his closet. Were I a citizen of the District, I would take as much pride in my new schools, and in the fine school system here, and in all that has been spent here, as do the Members of Congress who have approved the appropriations therefor.

The teachers and school officers in the District have been granted by the Congress salary increases of 53.1 percent since 1954, thus putting them at the top or very close to the top in all categories as compared with those in the surrounding metropolitan area.

Fifth. The District ranks No. 3 in per capita expenditures for fire protection.

Sixth. It ranks No. 4 in per capita expenditures in public welfare.

Seventh. It ranks No. 1 by a very wide margin in expenditures for personal services.

The Congress has approved and provided for a vast increase in the District of Columbia government personnel in the past 10 years. District of Columbia government employees totaled 19,818 in 1954. Today they total 29,242, an increase of 37.5 percent in the number of authorized positions, and an increase of 132.5 percent in the total gross payroll—from $82 million in 1954 to an estimated $192 million in 1965.

Actually, classified personnel of the District of Columbia have been given by Congress an increase of 38.8 percent in salaries since 1954. The police and firemen have enjoyed an increase of 49.3 percent in the same period.

As we consider the present legislation, I feel that we should have an understanding of the true facts. Such glaring inaccuracies have been spread around that many of our colleagues and the press have been grossly misled.

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in unqualified support of H.R. 11218, the bill to restore home rule to the citizens of the District of Columbia. I emphasize

the word "restore," since those who argue that home rule is radical or in contravention of the Constitution should bear in mind that Washington had home rule between 1802 and 1871.

As a preface to my remarks, I would like to point out that my support for home rule in no way reflects upon the integrity, diligence, or dedication of the great Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I am privileged to be a member.

My support does, however, reflect disapproval of a system under which 800,000 American citizens are forced to turn to congressional committees for legislative action dealing with purely local matters. It reflects upon a system under which the citizens of the District are governed by men like myself, whose loyalties are, at best, divided between Washington and their own home districts. It reflects upon a system where a dissatisfied citizenry has no recourse to the ballot box, to turn from office Representatives who are not serving the best interests of the District of Columbia. It reflects, in short, upon a system of government which is unrepresentative, and indeed undemocratic.

After reading the hearings and articles inserted in the RECORD, I have tried to assess the arguments of the opponents of home rule; but after cutting through the rhetoric I can only assume that the opponents believe that somehow the citizens of Washington are less capable of governing themselves than the rest of the Nation.

The opponents proclaim that the District of Columbia has the best form of government in the Nation. I think that the children who attend Shaw Junior High School might question this. I think that destitute mothers who apply for welfare for dependent children might question this. I think that local officials who must annually appear before congressional committees with hat in hand, for operating funds might question this. The fact of the matter is that no community which is governed by what is essentially an absentee government, is governed well.

Many groups such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs tell us that Washington is a Federal city and therefore somehow the local problems of its residents are secondary to the Federal interest. I do not deny that in purely Federal matters, the Federal interest must prevail. It is for this reason that the President retains veto power over acts of the Legislative Assembly. It is likewise for this reason that the compromise bill which we are considering requires congressional appropriation of the Federal payment.

This does not, however, mean that the residents of the District are Federal pawns. The truth of the matter is that my constituents in New Hampshire have demonstrated little interest in whether a local department store is authorized to use adjoining public space, or whether common law marriages can be contracted in the District of Columbia. These are local matters which are primarily of concern to the local residents, and which must be regulated at the local level.

The people of the District of Columbia have waited long enough. There is no excuse for further delay. Home rule now.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately this whole matter has degenerated into a civil rights question instead of one of home rule. Had it not been for the agitation by Martin King and his cohorts, together with the President's ill-conceived remarks about the possibility of a riot taking place in Washington, we would not be debating this issue today. Frankly, that statement of the President was the greatest flame-fanning act since Nero fiddled while Rome burned. Regardless of the merits of any issue it seems to take on an air of validity and urgency when advocated in the name of civil rights as has been done on the question of home rule. Frankly, neither the administration nor the Congress can say "No" to the demands of the racial agitators.

Mr. Chairman, the issue today is not one of home rule or better government for Washington, but it is simply a move for more votes. While it does not surprise me that the proponents of this measure are unmindful of the Constitution I still believe that all of us have sworn to uphold it and I, for one, am unwilling to back down on that obligation, regardless of any pressures exerted against me.

The power to exercise exclusive legislative control over the District of Columbia is expressly given to the Congress by section 8 of the Constitution. The writers of the Constitution certainly knew that people would come to live in the District of Columbia, so why then was it determined by them that those living within the District should not be granted complete jurisdiction over their affairs with the right to make laws for Washington? It should be obvious to any thinking person that the United States needs to have day-to-day management of the District within which the principal members of its executive, legislative, and judicial branches must function.

It is ridiculous that anyone should equate the District of Columbia with other American cities and to use that as a basis for advocating home rule. The difference between the national seat of government and an ordinary city is manifestly clear. The ordinary city is managed for the benefit of local residents rather than for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, and nationally motivated government rather than locally motivated government in the District is absolutely necessary. It would be a grave weakness in our system if the United States could not validly set aside an area as its seat of Government, as indeed was the intention of the framers of the Constitution, to be managed by the National Government in its interest.

It makes no more sense, Mr. Chairman for us to turn the government of the Nation's Capital over to the local residents than for a local county government to attempt to control and operate a Federal military base or other installations within its boundaries.

It is well to remember that the vast majority of the residents of Washington, D.C., directly or indirectly live from national revenues. They are either Federal employees or employees of businesses developed primarily for the housing, clothing, feeding, equipping, and otherwise providing the necessary services for those residing within as well as those visiting the Nation's Capital. They have not made the District; the District has made them. Additionally, we must be aware of the fact that almost 70 percent of the choicest property belongs to the Federal Government, foreign embassies, chanceries, national monuments and centers, churches, cathedrals, and people who have to pay taxes in their own home States.

Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is sui generis, and cannot be compared with any other political entity. It is the seat of the National Government and as our Nation's Capital belongs to the 50 States and not to the people of the District alone. Washington is not a London, a Paris or any American city where industry and business dominate government. This city is almost entirely government. It produces nothing in gross national products like Akron's rubber, Detroit's automobiles, Pittsburgh's steel, or the southern textiles. Its greatest industry is the Government of the United States which contributes a great portion of the cost of operating the District government.

While it may be true that some of the residents are well qualified for selection by their votes of the executives to govern them, and the representatives to make local laws, it is, also inescapably true that there exists an especially large percentage of citizens who have had little preparation for wise participation in local government. The peculiarly transient and fluctuating population of Washington is also to be considered in deciding whether the United States can safely entrust the management of its seat of government to the local population.

Mr. Chairman, there appears to be little, if anything, that I or any other Member of this body can say to change the opinion or vote of anyone on this highly emotional issue. Yet I urge my colleagues to consider anew their constitutional obligation and responsibility. I urge them not to be stampeded by any pressure from the Executive or any civil rights group before deciding the simple question on its merits as to whether or not Government employees within the District of Columbia should control our Nation's Capital or whether this should be left to the taxpayers of America who foot the bill. This is simply a matter of placing the national interest above local interests.

In closing, we might well remember a statement which was carried in an editorial in one of our large newspapers which reads, as follows:

Home rule would mean a city hall with life tenure for marble polishers and their helpers, nightcleaners, sanitary engineers, catch basin bricklayers. It would mean aldermen visiting San Francisco to inspect that city's underground garages, timing their junkets to be in Louisville on Derby Day. It would mean a civil service system giving pole positions to inlaws and municipal judges enjoying sabbatical leaves every 5 years. It would

mean buying tickets for ward committeemen's fish frys, all of the above and more to be paid for by the people of the United States. Home rule would raise a barrier that would shake the District from center to circumference for Federal employees who would not accept the city hall group.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I support any reasonable bill to clear the Halls of Congress of the domestic internal affairs of 800,000 people, official residents of the District of Columbia.

Perhaps at one time, 175 years ago, when we comprised a loose federated system, with a few million population, and the individual colonial rights a thing at issue, it was required that pursuant to the Constitution, the Congress maintain a tight control on a sparse area carved out of Maryland and Virginia to house the Nation's Capital. Over the years, the District has grown away from its parent States, as was the original intent. After the War Between the States when a mass exodus of Negroes from the South terminated in the District, perhaps again it was necessary to maintain tight Federal control.

Such is not the case today, however. The District today needs no protection from the States and likewise with the power of Congress the Congress needs little protection from the District. What then is the reason for Federal control of the District? Perhaps to safeguard the safety and tax-exempt status of public buildings and to maintain inviolate the welfare of Representatives residing in the District. These interests can easily be protected by retaining in Congress a residual authority which, in fact, the Constitution requires that the Congress retain.

The real problem is simply time. We have to face it. The United States is big government that raises and spends $100 billion annually all over the world and in 50 States. We cannot afford to spend 2 legislative days out of 20—10 percent of our time, on the Nation's Capital. The Capital is worth it but there are better ways to safeguard U.S. interests here.

We have been in session now for 9 months during 1965; we were in session well into 10 months last year and the entire year in 1963. To create a modern legislative system we have to delegate some functions.

The Congress today is just not interested in the bulk of the District of Columbia legislation, just as we are not concerned with ordinances in Alexandria, Arlington, and Montgomery County.

In the first 5 months of this session, in the House there were introduced 9,983 bills and resolutions plus 2,285 similar Senate measures. A casual listing of bills introduced during the months of April and May alone shows both the complexity and non-Federal nature of the bulk of the District of Columbia legislation. I include the list at this point:

S. 1713: To strengthen the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada (by request), April 6, 1965.

S. 1714: To amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the financial protection of certain persons suffering injury as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by uninsured motorists. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1715: To extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1716: To amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925, as amended. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1717: To provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1718: To provide for the compensation of overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1719: To authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, April 6, 1965.

S. 1817: To amend the District of Columbia public assistance law to clarify the categories of federally aided assistance recipients. Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, April 26, 1965.

S. 1852: To increase the annuities of certain schoolteachers in the District of Columbia who retired prior to October 1, 1956. Senator DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado, April 29, 1965.

S. 1853: To provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants. Senator DOMINICK, Republican, of Colorado, April 29, 1965.

S. 1872: To amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public schoolteachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946. Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, May 3, 1965.

S. 1929: To amend the District of Columbia income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as heretofore amended, provide that taxable income for District income tax purposes and not income for District franchise tax purposes shall conform as closely as possible to taxable income for Federal income tax purposes under the present and future income tax laws of the United States, except as otherwise specifically provided herein.. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada (by request), May 10, 1965.

S. 1930: To authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, May 10, 1965.

S. 1931: To amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, May 10, 1965.

S. 1932: To amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia," approved February 18, 1938, as amended. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, May 10, 1965.

S. 1933: To amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, in the Metropolitan Police Department band. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, May 10, 1965.

S. 1958: To amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia (District of Columbia Code 35–1301 to 35–1350) by adding at the end thereof a chapter, No. III, containing sections Nos. I through II, defining insurance premium finance companies; provide for the licensing and regulation of such companies by the Superintendent of Insurance, the establishment of charges which may be made by such companies; and provide a penalty for violations thereof. Senator TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland (by request), May 12, 1965.

H.R. 7044: To amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945. Mr. MACHEN, Democrat, of Maryland, April 1, 1965.

H.R. 7066: To provide revenue for the District of Columbia. Mr. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina (by request), April 1, 1965.

H.R. 7067: To prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government. Mr. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, April 1, 1965.

H.R. 7153: To eliminate certain restrictions on the assignment of Government field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia. Mr. BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Texas, April 6, 1965. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7173: To amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act and the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. Mr. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina (by request), April 6, 1965.

H.R. 7174: To amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons. Mr. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina, April 6, 1965.

H.R. 7395: To establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, April 13, 1965.

H.R. 7488: To authorize the use of certain real property in the District of Columbia for chancery purposes. Mr. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, April 14, 1965.

H.R. 7558: To amend the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia. Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, April 22, 1965.

H.R. 7559: Similar to H.R. 7558. Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, April 22, 1965.

H.R. 7624: To provide for regulation of the professional practice of certified public accountants in the District of Columbia, including the examination, licensure, registration of certified public accountants. Mr. FRASER, Democrat, of Minnesota, April 27, 1965.

H.R. 7724: To amend section 4 of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Act of 1947. Mr. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina (by request), April 28, 1965.

H.R. 7742: To amend section 3 of the act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia. Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, April 29, 1965.

H.R. 7869: To amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York (by request), May 4, 1965.

H.R. 7870: Similar to H.R. 7869. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, May 4, 1965.

H.R. 7871: To amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act for the purpose of prohibiting certain sales below cost. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, May 4, 1965.

H.R. 7872: Similar to H.R. 7871. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, May 4, 1965.

H.R. 7928: Similar to H.R. 7153. Mr. JOHNSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania, May 5, 1965.

H.R. 8058: Similar to H.R. 7724. Mr. NELSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, May 11, 1965.

H.R. 8090: To provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives for the District of

Columbia. Mr. BELL, Republican, of California, May 12, 1965.

H.R. 8115: To transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia court of general sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia. Mr. WHITENER, Democrat, of North Carolina (by request), May 12, 1965.

H.R. 8126: To amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law to provide broader coverage, improved standards of minimum wage and overtime compensation protection, and improved means of enforcement. Mr. MULTER, Democrat, of New York, May 12, 1965.

H.R. 8205: To amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, in the Metroplitan Police Department Band. Mr. SICKLES, Democrat, of Maryland, May 17, 1965.

H.R. 8251: Similar to H.R. 7066. Mr. O'KONSKI, Republican, of Wisconsin, May 18, 1965.

H.R. 8337: To amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act. Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, May 20, 1965.

H.R. 8466: To amend the Fire and Casualty Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of insurance premium finance companies in the District of Columbia. Mr. BROYHILL, Republican, of Virginia, May 26, 1965.

Mr. Chairman, there is not one issue raised by the referenced list of legislation that requires the Congress' specific attention. All these matters can be better delegated to a local council or mayor.

The issue raised in debate of whether District citizens are the kind of American citizens who have prepared themselves politically and otherwise to rule themselves is here not pertinent.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Sisk amendment, which would provide not only for home rule for the District of Columbia but for self-determination as well. Some who oppose it are saying that a vote for the Sisk amendment is a vote against home rule but this is absolutely wrong. I am for home rule for the District of Columbia and sponsored a bill, H.R. 5802, to provide for self-government in our Nation's Capital. But I also think it wise and fair and in accordance with democratic principles to give the people of the District of Columbia themselves a direct voice in framing the kind of government they want. This would be accomplished by the Sisk amendment. Under this amendment, within 100 days after the date of enactment, a special election would be held in the District of Columbia in which the voters would decide whether they want home rule in the first place which I assume and hope they do. Secondly, they would elect a Charter Board of 15 persons, citizens of the District. This Board, provided the first question were answered in the affirmative, would draft a home rule charter for the District of Columbia. It would hold public hearings. It would be given $300,000 with which to hire expert legal advisers. They would have to complete their work in 210 days and, within 45 days after that, submit the results to the voters in a special referendum. If they accept the charter, it would come to Congress, either House of which would have 90 days to approve or disapprove it. Should the Congress do nothing, the charter automatically would become law.

This procedure makes sense to me. It is the same procedure that is followed by every village, town, and city in the country which seeks a charter or a change in its existing charter. The people themselves decide. Now, Washington is unique in that it is the property of all the citizens of the country. The Sisk amendment protects the national interest in our Capital by retaining in Congress a final judgment.

The amendment is an amendment for self-determination, a concept for which we fought a revolution, which we have defended in battle numerous times and which we advocate for all peoples. The Sisk amendment will make self-determination possible for the people of the city of Washington. I hope it is adopted and that the people will draw a good charter so that popular and effective home rule will become a reality in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have come from attendance at the General Assembly of the United Nations, to which I am one of the five delegates from the United States appointed by President Johnson, to cast my vote for home rule for the District of Columbia. In 1949, when I came to the Congress, I declared myself for home rule, and I have signed every discharge petition in the years that have followed. I trust my colleagues will understand why I feel so strongly that I would not wish to be absent when at long last the opportunity has come to vote to lift the colonial status that for too long has been the unhappy lot of the fair city of Washington.

Today I was to have been with Secretary of State Rusk at a meeting with the foreign ministers of eight African countries that recently have become sovereign and independent nations. I would have been uncomfortable in their presence with the thought that I had passed up the opportunity to cast my vote in a critical rollcall for political freedom for the Capital City of my country. So much had they given to break the colonial chains, and so little was I asked to give.

I have listened to the long debate on the pending bill, and I have found it interesting and in the best traditions of this historic Chamber. What impressed me most perhaps was the very evident sincerity of the debaters. Those who were opposed to home rule seemed as deeply confirmed in their convictions as those who visioned in the issue the challenge of a crusade.

Mr. Chairman, I think it has been that way since first man started to reach out for some form of government in which recognition would be given to the dignity of man. Perhaps there always has been an honest difference of opinion as to how far the right of suffrage should be extended.

Hamilton and those who subscribed to his political philosophy thought that the right should be restricted to those who had the benefits of education and the responsibility of property ownership. Even within the spans of my own lifetime the majority of men of good will and sound reason believe that woman's place was in the home and not at the polling places, and I was past 30 years of age when women's equal suffrage became an accomplished fact.

I have had a long life. At 83 I am the oldest Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. There have been many changes since 1882, the year of my birth, in material things and our political thinking has taken on an enlargement in scope and a deepening in maturity that could be expected to accompany our advancement in possession and in power.

May I size it up briefly, and I think accurately, Mr. Chairman, by saying that the development to which the world has come is to the age of the dignity of man. In every nation is the longing to be free, to enjoy a full measure of independence and to map its own course. In every individual is the longing to be free, to stand on his own feet, neither slave nor master of any other man, in equality and in dignity combining with other men in mapping the problems and the courses of the governments of his community, his State, his Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have left my assignment at the United Nations to return to cast my vote for home rule for the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], as amended.

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SISK and Mr. MULTER.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 198, noes 139.

So the Sisk substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. SISK and Mr. MULTER.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair indicate to the Members what this vote is on at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the parliamentary situation is that if the Multer amendment, as

amended by the Sisk amendment, is rejected, we will then have before us the bill, H.R. 4644, as reported by the discharge petition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from New York in the event what he has described happens, then title I of the bill H.R. 4644, will be before the Committee for further action.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, if the motion now before the House prevails, then to all intents and purposes we will have the Sisk amendment or the Sisk substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, the Chair will state.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in the event that the matter now before the Committee carries and the Multer amendment, as amended by the Sisk substitute, is adopted, would it be in order to offer amendments to that substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be in order.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 198, noes 140.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4644, to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 515, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULTER. I am about to ask for the yeas and nays on the Multer amendment, as amended by the Sisk amendment. If that amendment is rejected on the rollcall vote, which I will ask for, will the pending business before the House then be H.R. 4644?

The SPEAKER. As introduced.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the amendment I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the Multer amendment as amended is defeated, we then go back to H.R. 4644. Is there an opportunity after that to amend or to further consider?

The SPEAKER. The response to that would be in the negative, because the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, just to get this matter clarified, as I understand the rule, if the Sisk amendment is defeated on the rollcall which is approaching, then we go back to the original first Multer bill, the bill for which the discharge petition was signed. That is the original first bill and there cannot be any vote on any compromise bill. The original Multer bill will then not be subject to further amendment or to any amendment.

The SPEAKER. It would not be because the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I make this parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia said subject to the right of the minority to offer a motion to recommit containing appropriate amendments with or without instructions?

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS. That one motion to recommit, depending on who decides to offer it, may be a straight motion to recommit without any instructions, may it not?

The SPEAKER. It could be.

Mr. HAYS. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Then the House would be faced with voting for or against the original bill Mr. MULTER himself abandoned. Is that not true?

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that the gentleman from Ohio answered his own question.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] demanded the vote by a call of the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 174, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

YEAS—227

Abbitt	Burleson	Delaney
Abernethy	Burton, Utah	Dent
Adair	Byrnes, Wis.	Denton
Andrews, Glenn	Cabell	Derwinski
Andrews, N. Dak.	Callan	Devine
Arends	Callaway	Dickinson
Ashbrook	Carey	Dingell
Ashmore	Carter	Dole
Ayres	Casey	Dorn
Baldwin	Cederberg	Dowdy
Bandstra	Chamberlain	Downing
Baring	Chelf	Duncan, Oreg.
Bates	Clancy	Duncan, Tenn.
Battin	Clark	Edwards, Ala.
Beckworth	Clausen, Don H.	Erlenborn
Belcher	Clawson, Del	Everett
Bennett	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.
Berry	Collier	Findley
Betts	Conable	Fino
Bonner	Cooley	Fisher
Bow	Craley	Flynt
Bray	Cramer	Fogarty
Brock	Cunningham	Fountain
Brooks	Curtin	Fuqua
Broyhill, N.C.	Curtis	Gathings
Broyhill, Va.	Dague	Gettys
Buchanan	Davis, Ga.	Giaimo
Burke	Davis, Wis.	Gray
	de la Garza	Griffiths
		Gross
Grover	Mackie	Sisk
Gubser	Mahon	Skubitz
Gurney	Mailliard	Slack
Hagan, Ga.	Marsh	Smith, Calif.
Hagen, Calif.	Martin, Ala.	Smith, Iowa
Haley	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Hall	Martin, Nebr.	Springer
Halleck	Matthews	Stanton
Hamilton	May	Steed
Hansen, Idaho	Mills	Stephens
Hansen, Iowa	Minshall	Stubblefield
Harris	Moeller	Sullivan
Harsha	Moore	Sweeney
Harvey, Ind.	Morris	Talcott
Hays	Morton	Taylor
Hébert	Murray	Teague, Calif.
Henderson	Natcher	Teague, Tex.
Herlong	Nelsen	Thompson, Tex.
Hicks	O'Neal, Ga.	Thomson, Wis.
Hull	Passman	Tuck
Hungate	Pelly	Tunney
Hutchinson	Pike	Tuten
Ichord	Pirnie	Udall
Jarman	Poage	Ullman
Jennings	Poff	Utt
Johnson, Pa.	Pool	Waggonner
Jonas	Purcell	Walker, Miss.
Jones, Ala.	Quillen	Walker, N. Mex.
Jones, Mo.	Randall	Watkins
Keith	Reid, Ill.	Watson
Kelly	Reifel	Watts
King, N.Y.	Reinecke	Whalley
Kirwan	Rhodes, Ariz.	White, Idaho
Kornegay	Roberts	White, Tex.
Kunkel	Robison	Whitener
Laird	Rogers, Colo.	Whitten
Landrum	Rogers, Fla.	Williams
Langen	Rogers, Tex.	Willis
Latta	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Lennon	Roudebush	Wolff
Lipscomb	Roush	Wright
Love	Rumsfeld	Wyatt
McCulloch	Satterfield	Wydler
McDade	Schneebeli	Young
McMillan	Secrest	Younger
Macdonald	Selden	Zablocki
MacGregor	Shriver	

NAYS—174

Adams	Gallagher	Morse
Addabbo	Garmatz	Mosher
Albert	Gibbons	Moss
Anderson, Tenn.	Gilbert	Multer
Annunzio	Gilligan	Murphy, Ill.
Ashley	Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Grabowski	Nedzi
Bell	Green, Oreg.	Nix
Bingham	Green, Pa.	O'Brien
Blatnik	Greigg	O'Hara, Ill.
Boggs	Grider	O'Hara, Mich.
Boland	Griffin	O'Konski
Bolling	Halpern	Olsen, Mont.
Brademas	Hanley	Olson, Minn.
Broomfield	Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.
Brown, Calif.	Harvey, Mich.	Ottinger
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Patten
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Pepper
Cahill	Hechler	Perkins
Cameron	Helstoski	Philbin
Celler	Holland	Pickle
Clevenger	Howard	Powell
Cohelan	Huot	Price
Conte	Irwin	Pucinski
Conyers	Jacobs	Quie
Corbett	Joelson	Race
Corman	Johnson, Calif.	Redlin
Culver	Karsten	Reid, N.Y.
Daniels	Karth	Resnick
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Diggs	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Donohue	King, Calif.	Rivers, Alaska
Dow	King, Utah	Rodino
Dulski	Kluczynski	Ronan
Dwyer	Krebs	Rooney, N.Y.
Dyal	Leggett	Rooney, Pa.
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Rosenthal
Edwards, Calif.	McCarthy	Roybal
Ellsworth	McClory	Ryan
Evans, Colo.	McDowell	St Germain
Fallon	McFall	St. Onge
Farbstein	McGrath	Scheuer
Farnsley	McVicker	Schisler
Farnum	Machen	Schmidhauser
Fascell	Mackay	Schweiker
Feighan	Madden	Senner
Flood	Mathias	Shipley
Foley	Matsunaga	Sickles
Ford, Gerald R.	Meeds	Smith, N.Y.
Ford, William D.	Miller	Stafford
Fraser	Minish	Staggers
Friedel	Mink	Stalbaum
Fulton, Pa.	Monagan	Stratton
Fulton, Tenn.	Moorhead	Tenzer
	Morgan	Todd
	Morrison	Trimble

Van Deerlin	Vivian	Wilson,
Vanik	Weltner	Charles H.
Vigorito	Widnall	Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Keogh

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson, Ill.	Holifield	Roncalio
Andrews, George W.	Horton	Roosevelt
Aspinall	Hosmer	Saylor
Bolton	Johnson, Okla.	Scott
Colmer	Lindsay	Sikes
Daddario	Long, La.	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Goodell	Michel	Toll
Hansen, Wash.	Mize	Tupper
Hardy	Patman	
	Rivers, S.C.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. George W. Andrews, for, with Mr. Toll, against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Roncalio against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RIVERS. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4644 to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 267, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

YEAS—134

Abbitt	Erlenborn	Martin, Ala.
Abernethy	Everett	Matthews
Adair	Evins, Tenn.	Mills
Andrews, Glenn	Findley	Moore
Arends	Fino	Morris
Ashbrook	Fisher	Natcher
Ashmore	Flynt	O'Konski
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neal, Ga.
Baring	Fountain	Passman
Battin	Fuqua	Poage
Beckworth	Gathings	Poff
Belcher	Gettys	Pool
Bennett	Gross	Purcell
Betts	Gubser	Quillen
Bonner	Gurney	Reid, Ill.
Bow	Hagan, Ga.	Roberts
Bray	Haley	Rogers, Fla.
Brock	Hall	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks	Halleck	Satterfield
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Selden
Broyhill, Va.	Harris	Sikes
Buchanan	Harvey, Ind.	Skubitz
Burleson	Hébert	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Smith, Va.
Cabell	Herlong	Steed
Callaway	Hull	Stephens
Cederberg	Hutchinson	Stubblefield
Chamberlain	Jarman	Taylor
Clancy	Jennings	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Johnson, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Cooley	Jonas	Tuck
Cramer	Jones, Ala.	Tuten
Curtis	Jones, Mo.	Utt
Dague	King, N.Y.	Waggonner
Davis, Ga.	Kornegay	Walker, Miss.
Davis, Wis.	Kunkel	Walker, N. Mex.
Derwinski	Landrum	Watkins
Devine	Latta	Watson
Dickinson	Lennon	Whalley
Dorn	Lipscomb	Whitener
Dowdy	McClory	Whitten
Downing	McMillan	Williams
Duncan, Tenn.	Machen	Willis
Edwards, Ala.	Mahon	Wilson, Bob
	Marsh	Young

NAYS—267

Adams	Curtin	Hagen, Calif.
Addabbo	Daniels	Halpern
Albert	Dawson	Hamilton
Anderson, Tenn.	de la Garza	Hanley
Andrews, N. Dak.	Delaney	Hanna
Annunzio	Dent	Hansen, Iowa
Ashley	Denton	Harsha
Baldwin	Diggs	Harvey, Mich.
Bandstra	Dingell	Hathaway
Barrett	Dole	Hawkins
Bates	Donohue	Hays
Bell	Dow	Hechler
Berry	Dulski	Helstoski
Bingham	Duncan, Oreg.	Hicks
Blatnik	Dwyer	Holland
Boggs	Dyal	Howard
Boland	Edmondson	Hungate
Bolling	Edwards, Calif.	Huot
Brademas	Ellsworth	Ichord
Broomfield	Evans, Colo.	Irwin
Brown, Calif.	Fallon	Jacobs
Burke	Farbstein	Joelson
Burton, Calif.	Farnsley	Johnson, Calif.
Burton, Utah	Farnum	Karsten
Byrne, Pa.	Fascell	Karth
Cahill	Feighan	Kastenmeier
Callan	Flood	Kee
Cameron	Fogarty	Keith
Carey	Foley	Kelly
Carter	Ford, William D.	King, Calif.
Casey	Fraser	King, Utah
Celler	Friedel	Kirwan
Chelf	Fulton, Pa.	Kluczynski
Clark	Fulton, Tenn.	Krebs
Clausen, Don H.	Gallagher	Laird
Cleveland	Giaimo	Langen
Clevenger	Gibbons	Leggett
Cohelan	Gilbert	Long, Md.
Collier	Gilligan	Love
Conable	Gonzalez	McCarthy
Conte	Grabowski	McCulloch
Conyers	Gray	McDade
Corbett	Green, Oreg.	McDowell
Corman	Green, Pa.	McFall
Craley	Greigg	McGrath
Culver	Grider	McVicker
Cunningham	Griffin	Macdonald
	Griffiths	MacGregor
	Grover	Mackay
		Mackie
	Madden	Pike
	Mailliard	Pirnie
	Martin, Mass.	Powell
	Martin, Nebr.	Price
	Mathias	Pucinski
	Matsunaga	Quie
	May	Race
	Meeds	Randall
	Miller	Redlin
	Minish	Reid, N.Y.
	Mink	Reifel
	Minshall	Reinecke
	Moeller	Resnick
	Monagan	Reuss
	Moorhead	Rhodes, Ariz.
	Morgan	Rhodes, Pa.
	Morrison	Rivers, Alaska
	Morse	Robison
	Morton	Rodino
	Mosher	Rogers, Colo.
	Moss	Ronan
	Multer	Rooney, N.Y.
	Murphy, Ill.	Rooney, Pa.
	Murphy, N.Y.	Rosenthal
	Murray	Rostenkowski
	Nedzi	Roudebush
	Nelsen	Roush
	Nix	Roybal
	O'Brien	Rumsfeld
	O'Hara, Ill.	Ryan
	O'Hara, Mich.	St Germain
	Olsen, Mont.	St. Onge
	Olson, Minn.	Scheuer
	O'Neill, Mass.	Schisler
	Ottinger	Schmidhauser
	Patten	Schneebeli
	Pelly	Schweiker
	Pepper	Secrest
	Perkins	Senner
	Philbin	Shipley
	Pickle	Shriver
		Sickles
		Sisk
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, N.Y.
		Springer
		Stafford
		Staggers
		Stalbaum
		Stanton
		Stratton
		Sullivan
		Sweeney
		Talcott
		Teague, Calif.
		Tenzer
		Thomson, Wis.
		Todd
		Trimble
		Tunney
		Udall
		Ullman
		Van Deerlin
		Vanik
		Vigorito
		Vivian
		Watts
		Weltner
		White, Idaho
		White, Tex.
		Widnall
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Wolff
		Wright
		Wyatt
		Wydler
		Yates
		Younger
		Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Garmatz Keogh

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson, Ill.	Hardy	Patman
Andrews, George W.	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Aspinall	Horton	Roncalio
Bolton	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Saylor
Daddario	Lindsay	Scott
Frelinghuysen	Long, La.	Thomas
Goodell	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Hansen, Wash.	Michel	Toll
	Mize	Tupper

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Toll against.

Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. George W. Andrews for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington, with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. Had he been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "no." Therefore, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. WHITE of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who if he were

here would have voted "yea." I voted "no." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "present."

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLANCY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 117, answered "present" 2, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

YEAS—283

Adair	Evins, Tenn.	McDade
Adams	Fallon	McDowell
Addabbo	Farbstein	McFall
Albert	Farnsley	McGrath
Anderson, Tenn.	Farnum	McVicker
	Fascell	MacGregor
Andrews, N. Dak.	Feighan	Mackay
	Findley	Mackie
Annunzio	Flood	Madden
Arends	Fogarty	Mailliard
Ashbrook	Foley	Martin, Mass.
Ashley	Ford, Gerald R.	Martin, Nebr.
Ayres	Ford, William D.	Mathias
Baldwin		Matsunaga
Bandstra	Fraser	May
Barrett	Friedel	Meeds
Bates	Fulton, Pa.	Miller
Bell	Fulton, Tenn.	Minish
Berry	Gallagher	Mink
Bingham	Giaimo	Minshall
Blatnik	Gibbons	Moeller
Boggs	Gilbert	Moorhead
Boland	Gilligan	Morgan
Bolling	Gonzalez	Morrison
Brademas	Grabowski	Morse
Bray	Gray	Morton
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Mosher
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Moss
Brown, Calif.	Greigg	Multer
Burke	Grider	Murphy, Ill.
Burton, Calif.	Griffin	Murphy, N.Y.
Burton, Utah	Griffiths	Nedzi
Byrne, Pa.	Grover	Nelsen
Cahill	Hagen, Calif.	Nix
Callan	Halleck	O'Brien
Cameron	Halpern	O'Hara, Ill.
Carey	Hamilton	O'Hara, Mich.
Carter	Hanley	Olsen, Mont.
Casey	Hanna	Olson, Minn.
Cederberg	Hansen, Iowa	O'Neill, Mass.
Celler	Harsha	Ottinger
Chamberlain	Harvey, Ind.	Patten
Chelf	Harvey, Mich.	Pelly
Clark	Hathaway	Pepper
Clausen, Don H.	Hawkins	Perkins
	Hays	Philbin
Cleveland	Hechler	Pickle
Clevenger	Helstoski	Pirnie
Cohelan	Hicks	Powell
Collier	Holland	Price
Conable	Howard	Pucinski
Conte	Hungate	Quie
Conyers	Huot	Race
Corbett	Hutchinson	Randall
Corman	Ichord	Redlin
Craley	Irwin	Reid, Ill.
Culver	Jacobs	Reid, N.Y.
Cunningham	Joelson	Reifel
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Reinecke
Daniels	Karsten	Resnick
Davis, Wis.	Karth	Reuss
Dawson	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Ariz.
de la Garza	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Delaney	Keith	Rivers, Alaska
Dent	Kelly	Robison
Denton	King, Calif.	Rodino
Diggs	King, N.Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Dingell	King, Utah	Ronan
Dole	Kirwan	Rooney, N.Y.
Donohue	Kluczynski	Rooney, Pa.
Dow	Krebs	Rosenthal
Dulski	Kunkel	Rostenkowski
Duncan, Oreg.	Laird	Roudebush
Dwyer	Langen	Roush
Dyal	Leggett	Roybal
Edmondson	Long, Md.	Rumsfeld
Edwards, Calif.	Love	Ryan
Ellsworth	McCarthy	St Germain
Erlenborn	McClory	St. Onge
Evans, Colo.	McCulloch	Scheuer
Schisler	Stalbaum	Vigorito
Schmidhauser	Stanton	Vivian
Schneebeli	Stratton	Weltner
Schweiker	Sullivan	Whalley
Secrest	Sweeney	White, Idaho
Senner	Talcott	White, Tex.
Shipley	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Shriver	Tenzer	Wilson, Charles H.
Sickles	Thomson, Wis.	
Sisk	Todd	Wolff
Slack	Trimble	Wright
Smith, Iowa	Tunney	Wyatt
Smith, N.Y.	Udall	Wydler
Springer	Ullman	Yates
Stafford	Van Deerlin	Younger
Staggers	Vanik	Zablocki

NAYS—117

Abbitt	Fountain	O'Neal, Ga.
Abernethy	Fuqua	Passman
Andrews, Glenn	Gathings	Pike
	Gettys	Poage
Ashmore	Gross	Poff
Baring	Gubser	Pool
Battin	Gurney	Purcell
Beckworth	Hagan, Ga.	Quillen
Belcher	Haley	Roberts
Bennett	Hall	Rogers, Fla.
Betts	Hansen, Idaho	Rogers, Tex.
Bonner	Harris	Satterfield
Bow	Hébert	Selden
Brooks	Henderson	Sikes
Broyhill, N.C.	Herlong	Skubitz
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Smith, Calif.
Buchanan	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Jennings	Steed
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Pa.	Stephens
Cabell	Jonas	Stubblefield
Callaway	Jones, Ala.	Taylor
Clancy	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del	Kornegay	Thompson, Tex.
Cooley	Landrum	Tuck
Cramer	Latta	Tuten
Curtin	Lennon	Utt
Dague	Lipscomb	Waggonner
Davis, Ga.	McMillan	Walker, Miss.
Derwinski	Macdonald	Walker, N. Mex.
Devine	Machen	Watkins
Dickinson	Mahon	Watson
Dorn	Marsh	Watts
Dowdy	Martin, Ala.	Whitener
Downing	Matthews	Whitten
Duncan, Tenn.	Mills	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Monagan	Willis
Everett	Moore	Wilson, Bob
Fino	Murray	Young
Fisher	Natcher	
Flynt	O'Konski	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Garmatz	Keogh

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson, Ill.	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Andrews, George W.	Horton	Roncalio
	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Aspinall	Johnson, Okla.	Saylor
Bolton	Lindsay	Scott
Colmer	Long, La.	Thomas
Daddario	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Toll
Goodell	Mize	Tupper
Hansen, Wash.	Morris	
Hardy	Patman	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. George W. Andrews against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Hosmer against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Thomas with Mr. Tupper.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Lindsay.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Mize.

Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 515 the Committee on the District of Columbia is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1118.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1118 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 4644, as passed, as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Charter Act'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. It is the intent of Congress to make available to the inhabitants of the District of Columbia such measure and form of local self-government as they themselves shall democratically establish if such self-government is consistent with the constitutional injunction that Congress retain ultimate legislative authority over the Nation's Capital. In taking this action it is further the intent of Congress to demonstrate its fundamental and enduring belief in the merits of the democratic process by exercising its retained legislative responsibility for the seat of the Federal Government only as it concerns amendments to any charter which might be established under this Act, but not as it concerns the routine municipal affairs of the District of Columbia.

"SELF-GOVERNMENT REFERENDUM AND CHARTER BOARD ELECTION

"SEC. 3. (a)(1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a referendum, on a day specified by it, not later than one hundred days after the date of enactment of this Act to determine if the residents of the District of Columbia want self-government for the District of Columbia. The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

" 'The voters of the District of Columbia are being asked in this election whether they want a District of Columbia Charter Board created whose purpose would be to write a charter for the District of Columbia. The charter, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the creation of a District of Columbia Charter Board? —— yes —— no.'

"(2) In order for the proposition to be approved, a majority of those voting must vote in favor of the proposition.

"(b) The Board of Elections shall also conduct an election on the same day as the referendum to choose members of the Charter Board (to be established in accordance with section 4).

"(c) Every qualified elector—

"(1) who has registered with the Board of Elections, in accordance with section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, for the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section and who the Board of Elections ascertains is still a qualified elector, or

"(2) who registers with the Board of Elections in accordance with subsection (d) of this section,

shall be entitled to vote in such election and referendum.

"(d)(1) The Board of Elections shall conduct a registration of electors under section 7 of the District of Columbia election law, during a period beginning as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and ending not more than thirty or less than twenty days before the date of the referendum and election.

"(2) The Board of Elections may by regulation prescribe any reasonable method for ascertaining whether a person registered to vote in the last election held in the District of Columbia prior to the date of the election and referendum authorized by this section is a qualified elector. Any such person who it ascertains is a qualified elector shall be notified by mail before the beginning of the registration period established under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(e)(1) Before the beginning of the registration period the Board of Elections shall publish in each of the daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia a list of registration places and the dates and hours of registration.

"(2) Not later than two weeks before the election and referendum, the Board shall publish and mail to each registered voter a voter information pamphlet which shall contain (A) a statement (not exceeding one hundred and twenty-five words in length) by each candidate for election setting forth his qualifications, (B) an argument for approval of the proposition to be submitted in referendum, and (C) if this Act is not passed in each House without opposition, an argument for disapproval of that proposition. Each argument shall not exceed five hundred words in length. The argument for approval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress who voted for the approval of this Act, one appointed from the House by the Speaker and one appointed from the Senate by the President pro tempore. The argument for disapproval of that proposition shall be jointly written by two Members of Congress, similarly appointed, who voted against the approval of this Act if there were Members in each House that voted against approval of this Act; otherwise such argument shall be written by one Member, who voted against approval of this Act, who shall be selected by the President pro tempore or the Speaker, as the case may be.

"(f)(1) In the election of members of the Charter Board, there shall be a number of different ballot forms equal to the number of candidates. The Board of Elections shall arrange such ballot forms so that the order in which the candidates' names appear on the ballot forms is rotated from one voting precinct to the next. The rotation shall be accomplished by arranging one ballot form so that the names of the candidates are listed vertically in alphabetical order and by arranging each succeeding form by placing at the bottom of the list the name which was at the top of the list on the preceding form. The forms shall be allotted to voting precincts by lot in a manner prescribed by the regulations of the Board of Elections.

"(2) Ballots and voting machines shall show no party affiliation, emblem, or slogan.

"(g)(1) To be a candidate for the office of member of the Charter Board a person must be nominated in accordance with this subsection, must be a registered elector of the District of Columbia, and must have been a continuous resident of the District of Columbia for at least three years prior to the day of the election. The President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and officers and employees of the District of Columbia shall be ineligible for membership on the Charter Board.

"(2) To be nominated as a candidate a person must present a petition to the Board of Elections not less than forty-five days prior to the election. Such petition shall contain signatures of at least three hundred registered electors and shall be accompanied by a nonrefundable filing fee of $25. The Board of Elections shall determine the validity of the signatures contained in such petition.

"(3) Members of the Charter Board shall be elected from the District of Columbia at large.

"(h)(1) In the election each voter may cast one vote for each of not more than fifteen candidates. The fifteen candidates receiving the largest number of votes shall be elected.

"(2) The Board of Elections shall certify the results of the election and referendum to the President, the Clerk of the House, and the Secretary of the Senate, and the Board of Elections shall issue a certificate of election to each person elected to the Charter Board.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF CHARTER BOARD

"SEC. 4. (a) If the proposition submitted to the referendum conducted under section 3 is approved, there shall be established an independent agency of the United States to be known as the District of Columbia Charter Board. The Charter Board shall be composed of the fifteen persons elected in the election conducted under section 3. The candidate for office of member of the Charter Board who received the highest number of votes in such election shall be chairman of the Charter Board until the Charter Board selects a chairman from among its number.

"(b) Each member of the Charter Board shall be entitled to receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Charter Board, except that (1) a member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not be entitled to receive such per diem for any day for which he is compensated by the United States for his services as such an officer or employee, and (2) no member may receive more than $5,000 in the aggregate for his services as a member.

"(c) The Charter Board shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel, as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(d) The Charter Board may procure, in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts or consultants. Individuals so employed shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Charter Board, but not in excess of $100 per diem, including traveltime, and while away from their homes or regular places of business may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) The District of Columbia government shall furnish such space and facilities in public buildings in the District as the Charter Board may reasonably request, and shall provide the Charter Board with such records, information, and other services as may be required by the Board for the carrying out of its function.

"(f) The Charter Board may hold meetings, hearings, and issue subpenas within the District of Columbia. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Charter Board or any member of the Charter Board designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member.

"(g) Hearings of the Charter Board shall be open to the public and shall be held at reasonable hours and at such places as to accommodate a reasonable number of spectators.

"(h)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $300,000 for the administrative expenses of the Charter Board.

"(2) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Elections such sums as may be necessary to conduct the election and referendums authorized by this Act.

"POWERS AND DUTIES OF CHARTER BOARD

"SEC. 5. (a) Subject to the limitations in subsection (b), the Charter Board shall have the power to propose a District of Columbia charter, within two hundred and ten days from the day on which the election and referendum is held under section 3. Such charter shall, if approved in a referendum conducted under section 6 and if not disapproved by Congress under section 7, establish a municipal government for the District of Columbia. The Charter Board may propose a charter only by the vote of a majority of its members, and only one charter may be proposed. A copy of the proposed charter shall be transmitted to the Board of Elections.

"(b)(1) The Charter Board is authorized to prepare a charter which may vest in a District of Columbia government complete legislative power over the District of Columbia with respect to all rightful subjects of legislation which are within the scope of the power of Congress in its capacity as the legislature for the District of Columbia as distinguished from its capacity as the National Legislature. The Congress reserves right, at any time after the adoption of such a charter to exercise its constitutional authority to amend in whatever fashion it chooses any charter written pursuant to this Act. Provisions of a charter may provide for subsequent amendment of the charter by the people of the District of Columbia. Such an amendment must be submitted in a referendum. However, such an amendment shall not take effect if disapproved by Congress in the manner provided by section 7(c).

"(2) The President of the United States may disapprove any legislation enacted by a District of Columbia government established under a charter approved pursuant to this Act, but his positive assent is not needed for any such legislation to take effect.

"(3) The Charter Board may also provide in the charter for the creation of such courts as may be necessary to assume the functions, solely relating to the affairs of the District of Columbia, of any Federal court within the District.

"CHARTER REFERENDUM

"SEC. 6. (a) The Board of Elections shall submit to referendum the charter proposed by the Charter Board. Such referendum shall be conducted by the Board of Elections, on a day specified by it, not later than forty-five days after the Charter Board transmits the charter proposed by it to the Board of Elections. The provisions of section 3 relating to the referendum conducted under that section shall be applicable to the referendum conducted under this section, except that (1) the registration period shall begin as soon as practicable after the transmission of the proposed charter to the Board of Elections, (2) the arguments respecting approval of the proposition shall be written by members of the Charter Board

appointed by the chairman thereof, and (3) the voter information pamphlet shall contain a copy of the proposed charter.

"(b) The following proposition shall be submitted to the voters in the referendum:

" 'The District of Columbia Charter Board has written a charter which, if approved in accordance with the District of Columbia Charter Act, would establish local self-government for the District of Columbia. Do you approve the charter? —— yes —— no.'

"APPROVAL BY CONGRESS

"SEC. 7. (a) A charter proposed by the Charter Board in accordance with section 5 and approved in referendum under section 6 shall be transmitted to the Congress. The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

"(b)(1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the District of Columbia Charter transmitted to Congress shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days following the date on which such charter is transmitted to Congress, unless between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such ninety-day period there has been approved by either of the two Houses of Congress a resolution stating that that House does not favor such charter.

"(2) If before the expiration of such ninety-day period the Congress shall approve a concurrent resolution stating that the Congress approves such charter, such charter shall take effect on the date of approval of such resolution.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection in the computation of the ninety-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain or sine die.

"(c) Amendments to such Charter which are approved in a referendum shall take effect in the manner provided in subsection (b) for such Charter.

"DISSOLUTION OF CHARTER BOARD

"SEC. 8. The Charter Board shall cease to exist seven months after the approval of the proposition submitted to referendum under section 3, unless the Board proposes a charter under section 5, in which case the Board shall cease to exist on the day after the day on which a referendum is conducted under section 6.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. For purposes of this Act—

"(1) the term 'Charter Board' means the District of Columbia Charter Board established by section 4 of this Act;

"(2) the term 'District of Columbia Election Law' means the Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101 et seq.);

"(3) the term 'Board of Elections' means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia; and

"(4) the term 'qualified elector' has the same meaning as it has in section 2(2) of the District of Columbia Election Law (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102(2))."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress, and for other purposes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the following title:

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

THE JEWISH NEW YEAR

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend the profound thanks of our colleagues of the Jewish faith to the Speaker, the Doorkeeper, the Reverend Braskamp, our Chaplain, for the fine cooperation extended to all of us during the new year holidays, and making available to us as a synagogue the prayer room of the Capitol. We extend our undying gratitude to the Speaker and to those who so ably cooperated in helping us observe this holiday, while at the same time permitting us to perform our duties in the House.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the balance of today, Thursday and Friday of this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader's inquiry, we have four more bills that we hope to dispose of this week, beginning with the Government Employees Salary Comparability Act, which will be the first order of business on tomorrow, then following that House Joint Resolution 642, Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, and H.R. 3142, Medical Library Assistance Act, and H.R. 6519, the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Act.

Mr. Speaker, we hope to transact this business as expeditiously as possible. We hope that Members may leave at a reasonable hour on Friday. It is also hoped that we might adopt a couple of rules on minor bills this evening. Then we will go over from Friday to Tuesday. That is our intention if we complete this business as already announced.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. When we adjourn on Friday, the majority leader will ask unanimous consent that we adjourn over until Tuesday of next week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

DEDICATION OF THE 100 HOUSES OF JARDINES VIRU IN LIMA, PERU

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, Mrs. Pepper and I were privileged to participate in a very inspiring occasion in Lima, Peru. It was the dedication of the first 100 houses of Jardines Viru to be finally a housing project of over 900 attractive, safe, sanitary, and thoroughly modern homes within a price range which makes them available for people in the low-income groups.

This great project was conceived and, through all the trials and tribulations one must encounter in such a project, brought to execution by an outstanding American, bearer of one of the most ancient and honorable names of Israel, his native land—a man not only of great business genius but of the keenest social conscience—Mr. Haim Eliachar—through his two companies, Development Corporation International and Proyecto Viri S.A.

The financing that made this meaningful project possible was furnished by Bankers Life Corp. of Iowa and the loan of Bankers Life was insured 100 percent by the Agency for International Development through its guaranteed housing program. This development is one of the finest examples of what the AID program, and particularly the guaranteed housing program is doing to help the people of Latin America to enjoy a better life.

The project is also made possible by the cooperation of the Government of Peru in taking proceedings which made the land obtainable and through the instrumentality of the Peruvian Housing Bank and a local savings and loan association providing available credit for the long-time purchase of these homes by the new owners.

It was a privilege for Mrs. Pepper and me to see how the cooperation of the Government of the United States and the Government of Peru with private enterprise in both countries made possible nearly 1,000 new houses which will be the homes of nearly 1,000 families.

Mr. Haim Eliachar who, as I said, initiated and constructed these homes, is a splendid example of the businessman being able to achieve a business success and at the same time to serve a high and noble social purpose.

The highlight of this dedication was the presence and the eloquent address

of the great President of Peru, His Excellency, Fernando Belaunde-Terry. President Belaunde is one of the outstanding statesman of the Americas, indeed of the world. He is a distinguished architect by profession, an eminent scholar and probably the best informed man of all men about his country and his people in Peru due to his most extensive travels to every remote part of the country, often on foot. President Belaunde spoke with moving sincerity of what this housing project meant to the people who would enjoy it and to the country. He revealed in this address the warmhearted sympathy he has for the problems of his people and his determination to help the people of his country in every way within his power to walk on higher ground to a better life.

Subsequently Mrs. Pepper and I in the company of our distinguished U.S. Ambassador, the Honorable J. Wesley Jones, spent an hour with President Belaunde at the palace. President Belaunde with elaborate maps and topographical representation told us of his stirring plans and dreams for building a network of highways throughout Peru and connecting Peru with surrounding countries, for irrigation to the arid parts of his land, for opening up fallow new lands east of the Andes, for developing vast housing projects and other aspirations he so earnestly entertains for progress with freedom for his great and romantic country.

While he has strong convictions as to what is best for his country and does not always agree with the policies of our country, I am sure, yet, President Belaunde is one of the new and dynamic leaders of the new Latin America which is rising upon the great resources of its people and natural wealth, its ancient glory and renown. All of the Americas, indeed the free world, is most fortunate to have as one of its leaders, with unsurpassed vista and vision of the future, such a man as His Excellency, President Belaunde.

I include the eloquent address of President Belaunde at the dedication of the Jardines Viru housing project in Lima at this point in my remarks:

PRESIDENT BELAUNDE'S REMARKS AT THE DEDICATION OF THE VIRU HOUSING PROJECT AT LIMA, PERU, SEPTEMBER 6, 1965

It is with deep satisfaction that I declare inaugurated this first group of houses of Jardines Viru; a first group that is only a small sample of the great plan being developed to serve fundamentally our economic sectors of limited capacity.

And this is one occasion in which we reaffirm the very cordial and close ties of continental solidarity with the presence of my very good and esteemed friend the Ambassador Jones, a fervent worker toward our national development, other than his own diplomatic responsibilities, and a member of U.S. Congress, Mr. PEPPER, who has come to Peru precisely to say a few words which are full of ideas and inspiration to perfect and make more viable the joint work which our people are doing within the Alliance for Progress.

It is very significant that in this makeshift street platform a distinguished member of the Peruvian Congress who also presides over this organization, Senator Carrillo Smith, and a distinguished Member of the Congress of the United States, a Representative of the State of Florida with whom Peru has very distant ties, have spoken here. We must recall that during the dawn of history, our great historian Garcilaso, not only dedicated himself to write the "Royal Commentaries" and the "General History of Peru," but also wrote a history of Florida. It is thus that our country and Florida State are united by the work of a great native historian who received through heritage and through inheritance all the virtues and the talent of the European conquerors and of the indigenous race to which he also belonged.

I feel very happy that centuries afterward this cordial tie with Florida State can be reaffirmed as I was lucky to spend some years there and that one of its most important universities gave shelter to my own family during the several years of our absence from the paternal soil.

I am, therefore, a witness of experience of what that great country signifies, especially of the unquestionable fact that the worker and the common man in no other country of the world enjoys the very high standards of living which by that great democratic and Federal organization has been able to establish. This is a great truth, one which no one can deny. No other systems have allowed the common man, the workman, to reach the high standards which have been reached by the workers of the United States; and this has been accomplished, precisely, through a dedication to work and by the excellent coordination of all the labor activities.

We have before us economic housing units, that is to say, the product of our time employed in labor, because we want to direct this activity toward satisfying the most needed necessities of the majority class of our country. And, actually, we now have in construction thousands and thousands of homes, and it pleases us to see how private activity is also helping in the solution of a very grave problem. In this case, the efforts have been joined by AID as the organizing entity, private capital of the United States, the national effort through the Banco de la Vivienda del Peru and the very meritorious efforts of Jardines Viru which I applaud and thank as an organization that though as all commercial entities must receive profits for its efforts, has not sought the field of speculation, but the honest and social work by which means it is greatly contributing to the purposes which motivate my government.

The housing construction not only represents work in which the contractor has to achieve units which are not costly, a size which is not too small nor excessive, work in which the engineers have to employ adequate and economic materials, and above all, specifications and techniques which would not be too costly. But all this would be useless if in the work itself there wouldn't exist the close and constant collaboration of the laboring personnel. The 50-percent savings in construction comes from the discipline of the work; it comes from the fact that no work stoppages occurred which only contribute to increase the work costs and, therefore, overloading the shoulders of those to whom these works would benefit.

The quickness of construction is one of the most important economic factors. In construction there are inevitable general expenditures in the technical direction—in watch duties, storage, etc. If the construction takes 4 months, these expenditures are considerably reduced in comparison with term of a year or a year and a half which represents frequently the delay of work in which discord or the lack of coordination have not allowed the work have the prompt completion which in the social and economic viewpoint we should endeavor to obtain.

This is why I take this opportunity to reiterate my cordial call to those whom, for all my life, have been my work companions, to the technicians and laborers of civil construction, for them to collaborate in this work of building for the nation, but not sumptuous buildings to serve a few, but of social improvement in service of the great national majorities; and that in each national effort undertaken, in each coordination and organization effort, and that in each result in the quickness of construction, it should be in future works a factor of saving and of economy that we urgently need to be able to give more homes for the same amount of money to the families who until now have been so deficiently housed in our country. On the other hand, in exchange and compensation, I can also reiterate on my part a security, the security that during my government there will be no job lacking for the construction laborer; the security that if this year we build one, next year we will build two. Therefore, a very promising future is offered to all those who work in the construction industry, because they can have the assurance that in the atmosphere of social fraternity and activity which reigns in the country, they will have work assured for the future years. And this is not restricted to the city of Lima.

Yesterday, at this same time, in a complete different atmosphere, in a warm and sunny climate, in our beloved city of Iquitos, I visited the Unidad Sargento Lores, which is being built there and I verified how the construction rhythm that is being undertaken by our Government, surpasses by a great margin the operative capacity of the country, and how much of the houses completely built, especially at Barrio Bermudez, where recently suffered a fire, have not yet been delivered to their occupants, because the doors and windows being built by local carpentries are not yet ready in view of the great demand of work required by the factories, the carpenters, and by the laborers.

And there, in Iquitos, after having visited Lores and Bermudez, I had the great satisfaction in a Sunday, of visiting Santo Cristo de Bagazán, located at a point on the beautiful and majestic Amazon River, where all the community is building, with their own hands, their own houses, but without knowing to whom the house they were building would belong. The work they were doing will be realized in an unselfish and uninterested manner in a project, which I believe, could be the foundation of future construction by popular cooperation. There, we have been able to deliver to the people for around S/. 13,000 in building supplies, and with just this portion, and with the help of the occupants, in a very short period they will have ample but honest houses.

Around all the Republic this system is progressing, and it is for this reason, that I have optimism and believe that the time has arrived when I must reiterate my calling to the construction laborer that with militant discipline, as an army which is obtaining the biggest conquest to which Peru could wish, that they work orderly in their constructions, resolve their business problems, and the outcome of their discussions, without recurring to stoppages of their work, which only cause danger to the Republic and causes damage especially to the classes with less economic resources.

In this ceremony we have listened to Deputy PEPPER, of the U.S. Congress, and his words representing the opening to a wide hope, the orientation of the AID—the Agency for International Development—at the service of the Alliance for Progress facilitating resources by means of limited loans which will be now in a more ample field making the AID a guarantee loan entity, now AID will be able to work in the vast field of the private capitals of the United States where, as we know, due to their saving capacity this possibility is unlimited. In this case, AID has not give the loans, it has limited itself

to guaranteeing those institutions who have loaned money to Peru in order to permit the achievement of this social welfare work. I praise this initiative and hope it will be extended to other fields: industrial loans and agrarian loans as I asked for in my inaugural message to the Congress. In this form and with the help and high authority of the AID and its international guarantee, significative investments can come to Peru to solve very grave problems such as housing.

I express to the Ambassador my gratitude for his attention to this work, for the plans being studied now and for the future. I ask you as of this moment to transmit to your Government my congratulations for this activity of the AID and my personal hope that with this system of international guarantee we can reach a wider and more closer exchange of politics and also a broader cooperation.

I would like to express my congratulations to Jardines Viru and also to wish to the new families already being settled here, happiness in this new neighborhood of Callao. I feel sure that once the school program mentioned by Senator Carrillo Smith, has been fulfilled—a very interesting collectivity will grow here. A community without a school is like a parish without a church. It is necessary to build this school as soon as possible. The Government and the Ministry of Education will support this effort with decision and enthusiasm.

Mr. Ambassador: I congratulate myself because it has been possible to meet with Members of the U.S. Congress and of the American institutions which work with you in this effort for achieving the success of your mission more than within the narrow limits of fulfilling just transitorily, but within the pattern of love for our country with admirable command of our language and a sense of cooperation which I am the first one in praising and thanking you for it. I would like to express these words to all of your cooperators, being sure our future projects through a close relationships will result in a fruitful benefit for our classes economically weak. This will also be an outstanding fact within the patterns of continental fraternity in which we both are so closely interested.

And to Representative PEPPER I would like to ask him to express to Florida in my behalf my friendly greetings, and also to the President of the United States, my words of fraternity and esteem and my fervent hopes in order that his policy will allow that all the strength of that great country should contribute in a growing proportion to the cooperation with the Latin American countries so that the teachings and experiences of the United States will allow us to give the Peruvian worker the standard of living which the laborer has reached in the United States.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL, OLD ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 581

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6519) to amend the Act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Missouri, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and pending that I will yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. It provides for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo.

As I understand it, there was no opposition to the bill in the legislative committee and there was no opposition expressed before the Committee on Rules.

The resolution provides for 1 hour of general debate. It is an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

I now yield to my colleague, the gentlemen from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 581, will provide 1 hour of debate under an open rule for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6519, a bill amending the act setting up the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo.

The sole purpose of the bill is to increase the appropriation authorization from $17,250,000 to $23,250,000.

The work on the memorial was begun in 1935 on a cost sharing basis of $3 in Federal moneys for each $1 raised by St. Louis. The 630-foot arch over the memorial is now nearing completion. An additional $8 million is needed; under the same ratio of cost sharing, the Federal share is $6 million.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and I do not know of any objection to this particular bill that the rule makes in order.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION OF THIRD LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 589, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 589

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 642) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Works now in the resolution and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original resolution. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the resolution or the Committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

I am sure that all Members of Congress are familiar with the proposed legislation. The Congress is in dire need of a third Library of Congress because of the crowded facilities in the present two libraries that we have. The bill would require 1 hour of general debate with an open rule.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 589 will provide 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 642) to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to construct the third Library of Congress building in square 732 in the District of Columbia, to be named the James Madison Memorial Building and to contain a Madison Memorial Hall.

House Joint Resolution 642 authorizes $75 million to construct the James Madison Memorial Library, the third Library of Congress building. The site is square 732 of the District of Columbia, immediately east of the Cannon Building and south of the original Library building.

The proposed building will contain a Madison Memorial Hall covering approximately one-quarter of the building's space; the remainder will be used by the Library.

The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to direct the construction from design to completion. The Senate version of the resolution removed the Architect and substituted the Administrator of General Services.

Square 732 has only about 85 percent of the space sought by the Library.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY LAW CHANGES HAVE NOT WORKED OUT THE WAY INTENDED

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have heard all of my life that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions." I think there is little question that Congress was motivated with the best of intentions when it approved the most recent changes in the social security laws, granting increased benefits to those covered by the law. But it seems that it has not worked out the way it was intended. During the past several days I have had communications from friends whose veterans' benefits and pensions have been cut due to the increase in their social security benefits, and the cuts have been far greater than the increased benefits. One 66-year-old veteran's widow, in reciting her case, said that the increased social security benefits put her $4.50 over the maximum income she was allowed to receive, resulting in her pension being cut more than $190 a year. In other words this poor woman would have been better off had she not been granted an increase in social security. In fact, her income has been cut more than $15 a month, which is a mighty big slice to take out of a budget of less than $150 a month. This and other similar cases has prompted me to introduce a bill today, which, if adopted as I hope it will be with a minimum of delay, would give any person the right to waive all or any part of the monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, to which such person is or may become entitled, and that the amounts so waived shall not be considered as income. This is just another instance, Mr. Speaker, of where it is not always wise to accept the old adage that "One should not look a gift horse in the mouth."

THE FEDERAL METALLIC AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, on September 2, the House passed H.R. 8989, the Federal Metallic and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act. This was badly needed and long-overdue legislation. It represented the combined efforts of many people and organizations.

At this time, I believe it appropriate to accord special recognition to the International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers for the vital role it has played over the years in bringing this legislation to pass.

Mine-Mill first interested the late distinguished Senator James Murray, of Montana, in introducing Federal metal mine safety legislation following World War II. This 72-year-old union of hard-rock miners has been in the forefront of the struggle ever since.

Mine-Mill took the initiative again in 1963 in proposing legislation to include smelters and refineries. It was my privilege to be among those who introduced mine safety bills in the 88th and 89th Congresses, including this broadened coverage. My bills were H.R. 4896, in the 88th Congress, and H.R. 7816 in the 89th Congress.

H.R. 8989 provides substantially the same coverage and enforcement set forth in H.R. 7816, except that smelters and refineries are not included. It is my hope that in the near future this extended coverage can be provided to protect the smelter and refinery workers in my district and in other parts of the Nation. I know that the Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers can be counted on to press for this objective.

I am personally grateful to the outstanding local miners unions in my congressional district—at the mining centers of Christmas, Morenci, Globe-Miami, Hayden, and Humboldt—for strengthening my own understanding of the problem of mine safety.

It was particularly pleasant to be able to work with Mr. Leo Terrell, international representative of Mine-Mill. Mr. Terrell happens to be a personal friend of many years standing. In fact, he comes from my hometown of Miami, Ariz. He is completely dedicated to the welfare and productivity of hard-rock miners and is thoroughly knowledgeable about the problems that culminated in the passage of H.R. 8989.

FEDERAL SALARY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will be debating H.R. 10281, the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965. Section 205 of that bill contains a provision affecting congressional salaries—not this year, not next year, but in succeeding years. I support this provision, and in an effort to acquaint my colleagues with it, I prepared last week and sent each Member of the House a four-page letter explaining its features and reasons for it.

Now I should like to go one step further. In years past, Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that our good friends in the press gallery take an unusual interest in bills which increase the salaries of Members of Congress. This interest is keen, and it is penetrating. It is also out of all proportion to the relative importance of such provisions in whatever legislation is pending.

Last year, we passed a pay bill affecting 2½ million Federal employees. Were our friends particularly interested in the pay of judges and Cabinet officers and postmasters and mailmen? They were not. It was as though that entire bill related only to 535 Representatives and Senators here on Capitol Hill. The other 2,499,000 or so employees were virtually forgotten as the stories went out on the Nation's press wires about the Members of Congress increasing their own pay.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that our friends of the press are dishonest or irresponsible. I am sure they emphasized the part of the bill they thought would be most interesting. But they had their fun, and now I think would be an appropriate time for them to acquaint themselves with the history of the Federal pay system, the principle of comparability we enacted 3 years ago, and the recurring problem of compression in the upper levels as executive salaries bump up against the congressional salary ceiling.

It may be that some reporter yet will imply that we passed a billion and a half dollar pay bill this year in order to increase our own salaries in some future Congress by $2,000 or $3,000. I hope not. I think the press is capable of doing a fair and honest job of reporting, and it is my hope that in the forthcoming debate our friends in the press gallery will view the provision relating to congressional salaries in the perspective of the bill as a whole. We who are the sponsors of this legislation have nothing to hide. We welcome the attention of the press. But we ask that the press exercise the same sense of responsibility that has been shown by the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on both sides of the aisle, in drafting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of full and complete reporting I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of my letter to the Members on this provision of the pay bill, and I should like to commend this letter to the attention of the press. I believe that if any reporter will take the time to read the reasons why this provision is in the bill, he will be less inclined to pounce upon it as another congressional pay grab, an expression I seem to recall from last year's headlines.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my letter at this point in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1965.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: H.R. 10281, the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965, is expected to be on the debate calendar next week. Section 205 of the bill would establish permanent machinery for the regular and orderly adjustment of executive, judicial, and congressional salaries. Many of you have asked for information about this provision; some have voiced apprehension. (No Member, as yet, has indicated an intention to refuse a 1967 salary increase if the section becomes law.)

Of course this is a politically sensitive issue to all of us. I want you to understand before the debate my reasons for believing that a provision of this kind is essential to a proper Federal salary system. This isn't a "pay grab," as I think you'll see if you struggle through the following paragraphs. And, in the judgment of this Member, it isn't politically dangerous. It's simply sound, necessary legislation.

My past and present support for more adequate congressional salaries is based upon two beliefs—and I list them in order of importance:

1. Efficient, honest operation of the $100 billion Federal Establishment is important to the security, welfare, and growth of the country and its 190 million people. That establishment is no better than the 2.5 million executives and career people who run it. For reasons mentioned below, adequate congressional salaries are the key to adequate executive salaries, which in turn are the key to a proper career salary structure at all levels.

2. Congress is now a demanding, full-time career, imposing unusual financial burdens on the fine people who serve. In fairness to them and their families we cannot shirk the responsibility of providing adequate salaries commensurate with the job of directing a $100 billion business.

Let me now develop four background points:

1. Under the Constitution, the 535 Congressmen are the only Federal employees required to participate in fixing their own salaries. The painful political nature of this responsibility is reflected in the fact that (excluding the 1964 act) Congress increased its own salaries only four times in the 98 years beginning in 1866. This strongly suggests that there is something seriously wrong with letting this matter ride for the traditional 15 to 25 years and then being faced, as we were last year, with voting for a very large salary increase.

2. Toward the end of these long periods, the entire Federal salary structure becomes a ridiculous sight. Congress will not permit, and properly so, assistant secretaries and agency heads to draw salaries larger than its own. Thus, we get a situation of compression, where congressional salaries are a rigid ceiling on upper executive levels, which in turn depress salaries right down through the schedule. We reached the preposterous stage in 1964, where the VA Administrator, in charge of a $4 billion budget and 161 expensive hospitals, was paid $21,000. Because of compression, the administrator of just one of these hospitals was paid $19,000; and the skilled doctor in charge of one wing of the hospital only $500 less than that. This violates the basic principle that a proper salary system should have reasonable differentials at different levels in accordance with difficulty and responsibility.

3. To meet this defect, and to solve it once and for all, I sponsored in 1964, and the House adopted, a simple, yet vital amendment. What the amendment said, in effect, was this: "At long last, we have a rational, orderly, balanced Federal salary system with proper relationships all the way from GS–1 through GS–18, and up to Cabinet rank. There will undoubtedly be frequent salary changes in the career levels, and we must act now to see that proper alinement, top to bottom, is preserved. Under this new law, congressional salaries (the key to proper executive salaries) will be 122 percent of GS–18. Let us provide permanent machinery which will keep congressional salaries at 122 percent of that level.

"We will simply write a permanent proviso requiring that whenever GS–18 is increased by 3 or 4 percent, at the beginning of the next Congress, congressional salaries will be increased by that same percentage. Thus, we will never again have "compression." Congress will never again wait 20 years to adjust its pay in large $7,500 increments. We will adjust congressional salaries automatically and regularly in small increments of perhaps $500 to $1,000. This will do justice to the people who make a career in Congress—but more importantly, it will provide the basis for a proper Federal salary system for all time."

4. Unfortunately, this provision was stricken out in conference. Now we find ourselves at the beginning of the same old cycle—with all classified and postal salaries starting to march toward and "compression" in the making.

There is never a good year to tackle this sensitive subject; the problem should have been solved permanently last year. But now—this year—in my judgment, is the time to meet it. If the House will keep a provision of this kind in the bill, and if I have the honor of serving as a conferee, I assure you, I will fight to retain it.

Let me comment on one final aspect of the problem. If section 205 is retained as it now stands, it would make the first automatic adjustment effective when the 90th Congress convenes in January 1967. But, because H.R. 10281 has both 1965 and 1966 classified raises, and because the 1966 raise is intended in part as a "catch-up" for the upper GS levels (now 3 years behind comparability), we find that the first automatic raise would be far larger than the $500 to $1,000 amounts which could ordinarily be expected. (It is my judgment that the formula in the bill would raise congressional salaries by some $2,500 to $3,000 in 1967.) This would still make congressional pay far below the $35,000 recommended by President Kennedy and his Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems in 1963. But, coming on the heels of the 1964 increase, this causes more serious political problems.

For these reasons, BOB CORBETT, the ranking minority member of our committee, will propose an amendment which will keep the permanent machinery of my proposal for small, regular, automatic adjustments, but would make the machinery applicable only to GS–18 raises granted in 1967 or thereafter. Thus, the first adjustment would come in January 1969 (two elections removed from now) based upon increases, if any, granted GS–18 in 1967 or 1968.

I am committed to support the bill as it came from the committee, including the 1967 effective date for section 205. However, I can appreciate the practical arguments which BOB uses in supporting his proposed change. It is my advice that the House work its will and use its judgment in resolving this difference.

However, I cannot too strongly urge that regardless of its effective date—whether 1967 or 1969—the House make sure that the permanent adjustment mechanism stays in the bill.

This is my story. I ask for your support and advice. I'm happy to answer your further questions.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS K. UDALL.

THE C–5A REVOLUTION IN THE AIR

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the C–5A will be the largest aircraft ever built and as retiring Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert has said it "will revolutionize everybody's ideas of distribution."

Starting on the drawing board as the CX–4 encouraged by the support of the Subcommittee of Military Airlift of the House Armed Services Committee, then headed by our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, the C–5A is approaching contract stage and by 1968 or early 1969 should be coming into inventory.

Expectations of this huge aircraft are will set out in a newsletter published by Eliot Janeway, highly regarded economist, and head of the Janeway Publishing & Research Corp. Under unanimous consent to do so, I herewith submit Mr. Janeway's fine summary of the C–5A potential to the attention of my colleagues in the House:

THE C–5A REVOLUTION IN THE AIR

A milestone in the commercial development of aviation—and in the growing significance of aeronautics in the world economy—is about to be passed. Month end is contract award time for the C–5A supertransport.

The C–5A will be the largest aircraft ever built, a four-engine jet capable of carrying 1,000 passengers, or 150 tons of cargo, over intercontinental distances at speeds faster than 500 miles per hour. The initial decision on the C–5A will be made by the Defense Department from alternative proposals offered by Douglas, Lockheed, and Boeing. Important as the military version of the C–5A will be to our strategic airlift capability, the real payoff on this fourth-generation air transport will come with its commercial application, sometime around 1970.

Each generation of transport aircraft has been defense generated except the first, the DC–3. The four-engine prop equipment that came out of World War II, including the DC–4 and its offspring, and the Lockheed Constellation, constituted the second generation. These were the aircraft which demonstrated during the Berlin airlift that continuous air transport of bulk goods was a feasible enterprise. Finally, the Korean war produced the Boeing jet bombers and tankers which soon had their commercial equivalents in the 707 and its competitors. Similarly, the development of the C–5A grew out of the obvious need for aircraft able to supply all the requirements for one or more Vietnams and Santo Domingos.

Recent revolutionary technical progress has brought the proposed supersonic transport (SST) closer and given it almost exclusive publicity as the next step in aviation development. But glamorous though the SST will be, nobody is going to make money out of it for years. Development costs are so high that, even with a generous Government subsidy, the price per aircraft will be exorbitant. Limited payload capability (by C–5A standards), and uneconomic compromise solutions of the sonic boom problem, make the SST no cinch or quick moneymaker for any carrier. In sharp contrast, the C–5A promises to be a bread-and-butter piece of equipment that will enable operators to eat cake, too.

As a subsonic aircraft, the C–5A can be activated directly on the basis of existing technology. Furthermore, the C–5A is so much bigger than any of the current crop of jet transports that it promises to revolutionize the economics of long-range transportation and supply. A dozen C–5A's could have done all the work of the 350-odd C–54's and C–47's that supplied Berlin during the 16 months of the airlift.

It behooves every corporation in America now making commitments for new plant and warehouse capacity around the world to keep a sharp eye on the job the C–5A will be doing by the time today's commitments go on stream. As retiring Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert recently told a group of New York fiduciaries, "the C–5A will revolutionize

everybody's ideas of distribution." It will revolutionize the economics of supply and inventorying as well.

FRANCIS STAN

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, that distinguished sports columnist for the Washington Evening Star, Francis Stan, reports that Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY called the Minnesota Twins' locker room immediately after they cinched the American League championship to congratulate the team and was invited to the World Series. Rumor has it the Vice President hopes to pitch the first ball in the World Series. This is a natural desire because the Twins are his hometown team for which he feels pardonable pride.

But there is a rumored snag. The President is expected to pull rank on the Vice President and is expected to ask to throw the opening ball. The President, in all probability, feels it his "solemn obligation" because of tradition, and his keen enthusiasm for sports. The fact that 95 percent of all television sets in the country will be tuned in at that particular time, of course, has nothing to do with the decision.

Mr. Speaker, if, indeed, it is true that these two great public figures are deadlocked on the right to throw the first ball, I realize it is presumptuous of me, a Republican freshman, to offer a solution.

However, since no one else has come forth with a workable solution, I would like to make the following proposal in the interest of good sportsmanship and fair play: That the President throw the first ball out of deference to his office and the fact that he might turn off the lights if it is cloudy or a night game.

Vice President HUMPHREY, by the way of compensation, could be made third base coach, a job he is eminently qualified to hold. There he could secretly call signals and at the same time keep an eye on left field where his friends play.

It is hoped that neither be allowed to umpire, since a "something for everyone" attitude could only lend frustration for pitcher and batter alike. In fact, it might disrupt the entire game.

Another rumor has been going around in this connection which has no foundation in fact: That is, that the junior Senator from New York, formerly from Virginia, formerly from Massachusetts, would like to play. I am told by an unimpeachable source that he is not being considered because if he got to third base, even by running for someone else, it is doubtful that he would know for sure which plate was home.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONER

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I will today release a statement relative to the recent added activity of the Civil Service Commissioner, Mr. Macy. It is my understanding that he has now joined the Arm-Twisting Corps. He is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and he has in addition to this responsibility been endeavoring to recruit qualified persons for appointive positions on behalf of the President of the United States.

In view of the fact he has failed to enforce the civil service laws under his charge, I would suggest to the Commissioner that he search for a new man to fill the job of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, one who will properly interpret the law, and will enforce it.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR ELMER THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to former Senator Elmer Thomas, who at the age of 89 passed away in Lawton, Okla., on September 19.

The State of Oklahoma and, indeed, the Nation have lost a great champion of democracy. He was an outstanding patriot and citizen.

As an ardent silverite, he was deeply concerned with finance and agriculture and widely known for his advocacy of the Patman bonus bill with its greenback clause.

It has been said by many of his friends that he owed his success to his watchfulness over the little things. Instead of following the procedure of the destructionist, who merely makes little things out of big ones, he had the knack of assembling the minutiae and converting them into life-size achievements. Several might be mentioned: one of them a 1,000-acre park, another a State capitol building.

Indiana was Senator Thomas' birthplace, but he was a prominent Oklahoman before Oklahoma's own first birthday as a State. From his farm home in Putman County, Ind., where he was educated in the common schools, he went to the Central Normal College at Danville, but not until after he had saved enough to carry him through by working on farms, in public works, and finally teaching school.

After graduating from college, he entered De Pauw University at Greencastle, where he was graduated in 1900 with the degree of A.B. He was admitted to the Indiana bar and turned westward. He spent a few months in Oklahoma City and then moved to Lawton which became his home.

In the years up to 1907 when Oklahoma achieved her statehood, Elmer Thomas became a more and more prominent figure in the community and when, out of the bitter controversy that arose over the choosing of the first State senator, a compromise was agreed upon, the rising young lawyer found himself the fortunate man. Elected to the State senate he threw himself into the legislative activities with the same zeal and application which he had shown in his private affairs. He soon became known as an expert parliamentarian.

His first step into the national arena was election to the House of Representatives in 1924. National politics were not entirely strange to him when he entered Congress. At the beginning of World War I, against great obstacles, he was prominent in the establishment of one of the 16 great national training camps at Fort Sill, Okla.

In the House he served on the Claims, Public Lands, and Roads Committees.

In 1926 Elmer Thomas was elected to the U.S. Senate where he served with distinction for 24 years.

He soon began making his presence felt. He served as chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee, on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on the Appropriations Committee, the Library Committee, and became chairman of a special Committee on Silver.

Besides the prominence he took whenever the question of the currency arose and there was a chance for him to speak a good word for silver, he worked hard in his capacity as chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. He also played a great part in shaping the appropriation bills for the Army, Navy, and Interior.

He was a strong force in the New Deal and was an expert on Indian affairs, financial affairs, agriculture, and oil.

Quiet and dignified in his bearing, serious and studious, he was credited with a social temperature that made his relationships cordial.

Senator Thomas strove for orderliness in the complexity of governmental affairs. Few Members of the Congress have had the capacity for so wide a range of legislative interest.

ROBERT M. HARRISS PAYS TRIBUTE

Mr. Speaker, a good patriotic American, Robert M. Harriss, of New York, was one of Senator Thomas' most ardent supporters. His letter to me concerning the death of his long-time friend, Senator Thomas, is self-explanatory:

FOREST HILLS, N.Y., *September 21, 1965.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WRIGHT: I was deeply grieved to hear of our old friend, Senator Elmer Thomas' death. He was a patriot, loved God and his country and fellow man.

Senator Thomas and you led the fight in Congress for monetary reform which resulted in our country getting off the old ruinous gold basis of $20.67 for the dollar. This broke the devastating depression of the early 1930's. In fact it was the only major legislation at that time which was upheld by the Supreme Court as constitutional.

I still remember well the unwarranted abuse and smearing that you both took for your patriotic efforts.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

ROBERT M. HARRISS.

LET'S EDUCATE MILITARY REJECTEES TO HELP SERVE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EFFORT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which I feel is long overdue, and is essential to our national defense effort in these times of crisis around the world. I also feel it can improve the fairness of military obligations and improve the educational attainment of trainable persons.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 11153, would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a special educational training program for enlistees and draftees in the Armed Forces who would otherwise fail to meet minimum requirements because of education deficiencies, but who can be brought up to the necessary minimum educational standards.

The facts supporting my bill are evidence for the need to train those numerous young men who are rejected for military duty because they cannot meet the required mental qualifications and standards of our Armed Forces.

About one-third of all young men who volunteer and who are drafted for military service are rejected because of mental and educational deficiencies.

This is alarming when we realize that many of the most brilliant and promising of our young population are now fighting a war in Vietnam, and things are not on the rosy side in other parts of the world: Southeast Asia, Latin America, and the always potentially explosive West European theater.

During fiscal year 1964, according to the Secretary of the Army, over 181,000 young men volunteered for enlistment in the Regular Army. About 111,200 met all mental, and physical, and moral standards. Of the 69,900 who were rejected, 700 failed because they could not meet moral standards or because they lacked both mental and physical minimum qualifications.

Some 56,600 volunteers were turned down last year because their mental test scores were too low. This is shocking and something must be done.

I propose that of these mental rejectees those who can be trained for useful military service, be trained and schooled in needed basic educational requirements so that they may meet the minimum requirements of the Armed Forces, and be retained in the service to fulfill their military obligation. This is not a social or antipoverty experiment. This is securing America's future by expanding our pool of able-bodied, mentally sound young men to keep the peace. It will have incidental benefits of spreading the opportunity for service in a broader population and in gaining educational opportunities for those involved.

My legislation is needed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to proceed with this program, after appropriate congressional hearings by the Armed Services Committees and the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. Full hearings on this bill will establish this program as a military training program vital to our Nation's security.

In working on this legislation I have had the benefit of the wide experience of Mr. Frank D. Bisbee, chairman of the board of the Bisbee-Baldwin Corp., of Jacksonville, Fla., who served for many years as chairman of the selective service board in my hometown. I was greatly impressed by his concern that many young men of apparent strength, energy, and mental intelligence were being rejected for military service. Either the standards were too high, or these young men lacked the educational training to make them good soldiers.

In support of this legislation I am drawing on the fine presentation by the Department of the Army over the last year of its special training enlistment program—STEP. The purpose of the STEP is to increase the number of volunteers accepted by the Army without lowering standards. The Army proposes to give educational training to some volunteers for enlistment in the Army who are now being turned away because they do not meet Army enlistment standards. If the extra training or treatment brings a man up to the enlistment standards, he will then serve out the balance of a 3-year tour; if a man fails to achieve the Army's standards, he will be discharged. The weakness of the STEP program is that its future is in doubt because of lack of specific authorizations by Congress and because it does not apply to draftees or to any service except in the Army.

This productive program should certainly be made available not only to those volunteers who enlist for 3 years in the regular service, but also to draftees who must serve 2 years in the Armed Forces. It should also most certainly be made available to other services, not just the Army.

In a recent Gallup poll, some 83 percent of those responding to a poll favored a program requiring all physically fit young men who cannot pass an educational test to serve for at least 1 year in some other form of military service. This indicates the mood of the country to retain these rejectees in the service. My bill would help train these young men for useful military service.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful for early hearings on my bill which would do away with a great annual waste of potential military talent, and make them better citizens of our Nation and better able to serve themselves and their families.

The bill H.R. 11153, as introduced, follows:

H.R. 11153

A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a special educational training program for enlistees and draftees in the Armed Forces who would otherwise fail to meet minimum requirements of the Armed Forces because of educational deficiencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to carry out a special educational training program for enlistees and draftees, in the Armed Forces who, because of educational deficiencies, would otherwise fail to meet minimum requirements of the Armed Forces, but who with such training can become useful members of the Armed Forces, and to retain them in the service to fulfill their military obligation. The period of such educational training shall be counted as a part of the obligated service of each such enlistee or draftee. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT SHOULD INVESTIGATE RACIAL MURDER CASE IN HAYNESVILLE, ALA.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with virtual disbelief that I read reports on the prostitution of justice that is currently being perpetrated in Haynesville, Ala., where a local man is being tried for the slaying last month of Jonathan M. Daniels, a ministerial student and civil rights worker. Judge T. Werth Thagard is clearly engaged in the most flagrant prejudicial action in order to achieve an acquittal for the accused man, Thomas L. Coleman. The judge has denied the prosecution a delay to permit Father Richard Morrisroe, a priest who was shot with Daniels, to give testimony favorable to the prosecution. Father Morrisroe is still hospitalized from his wounds. I cannot fail to observe that there was a day when southern justice depended largely on all-white juries to grant acquittals for racial crimes. It seems clear to me now that southern courts are not even going through the motions of dispensing justice fairly. The trial in Haynesville and other recent examples of southern judicial procedure suggests that the State judiciaries have flung defiance at the Nation in order to protect the most vicious agents of the white supremacy system. I implore the Justice Department to seek out the power to prevent this outrageous judicial approval of racial murder.

ARCHBISHOP-ELECT PHILLIP M. HANNAN

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that one of the distinguished clergymen from the Washington diocese who preached the funeral oration for our late beloved President Kennedy, Bishop Hannan, has been named as archbishop-elect of the diocese of New Orleans. We in the great southern city of New Orleans are very happy indeed to welcome him to our city.

PROTEST AGAINST SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, 1965, because I felt there was a pronounced and continuing need for America to express itself against Russia's persecution of its Jewish citizens, I introduced in the Congress House Concurrent Resolution 177.

Last March, in a speech delivered from the floor of the House, I spoke out against the Soviet Union's abuses of its Jewish subjects. We are now in the midst of the High Holy days of the Jewish religion, Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur. There is no more appropriate time than this to remember the Jews in the Soviet Union who cannot observe these holidays, and once more, my distinguished colleagues, I fervently appeal to you to join me in publicly condemning the actions of the Soviet Union.

Persecution in the Soviet Union is by no means an innovation. As far back as the 1800's, Russians isolated the Jews in ghettos and periodically raided these villages and killed and tortured thousands of Jews. It was necessary not only for the Jewish citizens, but for their religious leaders, the rabbis, to keep arms in their basements to protect themselves. It is true we do not hear of murders of Jews today but religious discrimination continues to exist in Russia. During the week of September 13, I attended a conference given by the National Vigil for Soviet Jewry and I heard with horror and anguish the discrimination, repression, and bigotry to which the Jewish people in Russia are being subjected.

Let us join in urging Russia to extend to the Jews the same rights and privileges enjoyed by other Soviet national and religious groups, to enable Jews to participate once more in their cultural traditions and in their communal institutions so that these traditions and institutions may be enhanced and perpetuated, to permit the local manufacture, import, and distribution of religious articles which are vital to Judaism, to permit Soviet Jewry to maintain religious and cultural bonds with Jewish communities abroad, to permit Jews whose families were ruptured by the Nazi cataclysm to reunite with them in other lands and to use every other possible means to eliminate anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

Let us unite in reaffirming to the Soviets and to all nations our belief that mankind the world over should be free from tyranny and oppression. I am hoping that before the end of the 89th Congress the Members of this body, by passage of House Concurrent Resolution 177, shall express themselves with such certainty that there can be no mistake on this vital issue.

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PERSONALITY TESTING

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many citizens of the country are encouraged that a Special Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee has conducted a thorough inquiry into the matter of psychological and personality testing.

And any recommendations the subcommittee can provide will surely be welcome. It seems clear that some kind of remedial action is needed, through legislation or another approach.

There are two aspects to the growing problem. The first is with regard to the testing of psychological conditions. The second has to do with tests meant for measurement of academic achievement but which are evidently being slanted in a way which conveys political or ideological significance.

No responsible person will quarrel with the need for having either kind of testing. They have a proper place in education and in the study of psychology.

But they must be recognized as tools which can be used for ill purpose, either by overly enthusiastic educators or a Federal bureaucracy directed by an ambitious political regime.

Never before have the American people been subjected to such threats to privacy by the Government itself or by Government subsidized organizations. We are told that wiretapping by some Government agencies is now regarded as an accepted practice. At least one agency is engaging in organized practice of various techniques to invade the private lives of individuals and families.

Add to this the abuse of testing, and we are faced with a situation which brings us far closer to the "1984" of George Orwell, and the "The Brave New World," of Aldous Huxley.

We pride ourselves on being individuals, and we trace our history to men and women who sought freedom from oppression of any kind.

Yet today we seem to be marching without effective protest into a situation in which a Washington directorate can act as a "big brother" by making rules and setting standards from which no deviation is tolerated.

News reports published this morning tell of a great new testing program being undertaken by the Office of Education. The program will not only test more young people than ever before, but will also go into new kinds of questions, and there is serious doubt as to what, if any, limitations apply to what kinds of questions may be asked of our young people in public schools. The objectives of this new program are not primarily to measure academic achievement, but rather to adjust social conditions to conform with ideas established in the Federal bureaucracy.

We do know that thousands of schoolchildren have been asked of their attitudes toward sex, religion, and family relationships. And we know that children cannot be expected to do anything but tolerate even very personal questioning.

We also know that in today's political climate, Government employees or private industry employees where Government contracts are a big factor and applicants for Federal jobs, all submit to tests in a docile manner.

It has been brought to light in the past 2 weeks that political connotations have been conveyed in some tests. And the ranking Republican member of the House Education and Labor Special Subcommittee on Education has asked the Commissioner of Education if Federal funds are being used to purchase politically slanted materials used in public schools.

This is a problem area which badly needs the continuing and extensive attention of the American people and, therefore, of the Congress.

In each case in world history in which a representative government has deteriorated into dictatorship, control of attitudes of the people has been a major tool of a power-hungry government clique. And it has been accomplished under the guise of welfare or progress. And in each case the people sat by quietly at the early stages of development of this control, until the point of no return had been reached.

And then, of course, there is no longer any opportunity for anyone to speak out for their rights as individuals and for the principles of free speech and individuality.

Surely, this country will not permit that to happen here.

I include in my remarks an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today which touches on this subject.

PEEPING ON THE GRAND SCALE

Psychological testing, like testing for aptitudes, doubtless has its place and uses. But it is a question whether the wholesale peeping into people's minds that is going on in Government, industry, and schools is desirable, necessary, or even effective.

Winding up a 3-month inquiry into such psychological and personality testing, a House Government Operations Subcommittee heard pleas from a number of witnesses that Congress adopt curbs against the indiscriminate use of the quizzes. It is easy to see why.

The committee found, among other nauseous examples, that employees of the Bonneville Power Administration being considered for promotion were asked questions like

"Which would you rather do: (a) kiss a person of the opposite sex, or (b) experiment with new things. Choose one."

It further learned that the Labor Department last year gave psychological tests to more than 20,000 applicants for counseling jobs in youth opportunity projects. The applicants were supposed to give their reactions to the following kinds of statement: "Most people worry too much about sex," and, "I think Lincoln was greater than Washington."

Moreover, thousands of schoolchildren, under research projects financed by the U.S. Office of Education, have undergone psychological testing in an attempt to probe their attitudes toward sex, religion, and family life.

Perhaps the most extraordinary thing about it all is the docility with which candidates for Government jobs, Federal employees, people in industry—where testing seems on the increase—and schoolchildren tolerate the intimate questioning. Especially with a tool still of dubious value.

One reason, perhaps, is that advanced by Dr. Karl Smith, professor of industrial psychology at the University of Wisconsin: "The American people have been fooled into believing that a few simple-minded true-false or multiple-choice questions can be used to forecast the careers of their children in school and in the university and to predict their own careers in work because of two influences: Fear of the pseudo-quantitative, mental-medical mumbo-jumbo of the psychiatrist and clinical psychologist, and the misleading propaganda of organized psychology in claiming that guesswork and statistical shotgun procedures have medical and scientific significance."

If that is true, maybe what's really needed to bridle the inquisitive testers is not a new law but simply the application of a little horsesense and elementary respect for privacy.

U.S. TRADE SURPLUS SHRINKS—MORE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS TROUBLE AHEAD

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for years, while the United States has been experiencing recurrent deficits in its balance of payments, we could always point with pride at our growing trade surplus. It has been this trade surplus that has helped to finance the individual deficit items in our balance-of-payments account without running as large an overall deficit as we otherwise would have done. One reason for the strength of our trade position has been the remarkable stability of U.S. export prices while the export prices of foreign nations have moved sharply upward. Recently, however, both these trends have begun to slow down in a manner that may spell trouble for the United States.

International Monetary Fund reports show that the average price of U.S. exports, which as recently as last fall stood at 103 percent of the 1958 average, no higher than in 1961, has jumped to 105 percent. At the same time, the export price indexes of many other trading nations seem to be leveling off. The index covering the major industrial nations of continental Europe, for instance, rose 4 percent between mid-1963 and mid-1964, but has remained at 104 percent of the 1958 average since early last year.

This may account in part for the fact that during the first 7 months of 1965, our trade surplus as a seasonally adjusted annual rate was $4.9 billion, or down about $2 billion from the 1964 level. Imports through July were running at an annual rate of 12 percent above the 1964 level while exports were only 2 percent higher.

We do not have to look very far to find a reason for this behavior. It is no coincidence that IMF figures show that living costs in many foreign nations are climbing less sharply than they once were while, at the same time, there are signs of a faster rise in the U.S. cost of living. In recent years, the U.S. index has risen about 1.2 percent annually, but in the first half of this year, the rise has amounted to 1.1 percent. The period of mild annual price rises may well be over.

The rapid pace of the American economy has certainly put increasing upward pressure on U.S. prices. Some indications of the price pressure are that our factories are now operating at about 90 percent of capacity and unemployment among married men, the backbone of the labor force, now amounts to about 2.3 percent, down sharply from the 5.1 percent early in the current economic expansion. In addition, the prospect of increased defense spending for Vietnam is in the wind.

There appears to be no such mounting price pressure in the foreign countries that compete with the United States in world markets. There are indications that Europe's economic expansion is slowing down, most probably because of restrictive, anti-inflationary government policies.

A recent study by the Boston Federal Reserve Bank also indicates the U.S. competitive position in world markets may be getting rapidly weaker. All of these factors pointing to a deterioration in the U.S. trade position do not necessarily mean that we are going to lose our position as world trade leader. But, as a recent article in the Wall Street Journal points out, the record of recent months suggests that massive trade surpluses are by no means guaranteed. And with the shrinkage of these significant surpluses, this country's balance-of-payments problem may become worse than it already is. Under unanimous consent, I include the article in the August 23 edition of the Wall Street Journal, in the RECORD at this point:

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

For years the large and growing trade surplus of the United States has been the envy of foreign capitals. In 1964 it reached a record $6.7 billion and, though the final total probably won't match last year's, all signs point to another multibillion-dollar surplus for 1965. A singular statistic helps explain this happy trend: The average price of U.S. exports has remained remarkably flat in a period when the general price movement in world markets has been sharply upward.

Very recently, however, this picture has begun to change—in a manner that does not augur well for the United States. International Monetary Fund reports show that the average price of U.S. exports, which as recently as last fall stood at 103 percent of the 1958 average of 100, has jumped to 105; the significance of this increase can be appreciated if one considers that the export price index, at 103 last fall, was no higher than in 1961.

At the same time, after climbing steadily for years, the export price indexes of many other trading nations appear to be leveling off. The index covering the major industrial countries of continental Europe, for instance, has remained at 104 percent of the 1958 average since early last year; between mid-1963 and mid-1964, in contrast, this index climbed 4 percent.

In Japan, export prices have stood at 101 percent of the 1958 base since the start of last year; in the previous 2 years, by comparison, the Japanese index climbed more than 4 percent. At 98, Canada's export price index is actually a point below the level at the end of last year. Other countries where export prices have declined in recent months include Italy, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and Switzerland. Export prices have remained flat, or nearly so, in the United Kingdom, France, and West Germany.

By no coincidence, IMF figures show, living costs in many of these nations are climbing less sharply—at the very time there are signs of a faster rise in the U.S. cost of living. In France, where President de Gaulle has launched an anti-inflation drive, living costs have barely budged since the start of the year. In the previous 12 months, by comparison, they increased nearly 4 percent, and the gain was even sharper before 1964.

The living-cost pattern appears similar in such other lands as West Germany, Italy, and Britain, where the government has recently taken major steps to hold down prices. In Japan, where the cost of living had been rising especially swiftly, living costs actually fell in a recent month.

The U.S. cost-of-living index, on the other hand, has begun to move up at a faster pace. In recent years, the U.S. index has risen at the relatively mild rate of about 1.2 percent annually. In only the first half of this year, however, the rise has amounted to 1.1 percent, a gain that clearly indicates the recent period of 1.2 percent annual gains may be over.

The rapid pace of the American economy, of course, has tended to put increasing upward pressure on U.S. prices. American factories, which a few years ago were using less than 80 percent of their full capacity, now are operating at about 90 percent, according to Federal estimates. This rate, history suggests, is dangerously near the level at which prices begin to move up swiftly.

Similar pressure on U.S. prices is indicated by labor statistics. The rate of unemployment among married men, the backbone of the labor force, amounts to only 2.3 percent, down sharply from 5.1 percent early in the current economic expansion. On top of all this, the prospect of rising defense outlays for Vietnam can only add inflationary pressure.

There appears to be no such mounting price pressure in many countries that compete with the United States in world markets. A recent report by New York's Chase Manhattan Bank states that "the tempo of Europe's economic expansion has slowed considerably this year" and attributes the slowdown to "restrictive, anti-inflationary policies on the part of most governments."

For instance, according to the report, wage rates in most European countries are rising more slowly than a year ago. In France, typically, wages climbed only 2 percent in the first half of 1965, down from a 3.2 percent gain in the like 1964 period. It also should be noted that the Vietnam war is placing relatively little strain on most European economies; Britain, in fact, recently announced a $616 million slash in its annual

defense budget, as part of its fight against inflation.

A study by the Boston Federal Reserve Bank, discussed in the July issue of the bank's monthly business review, also indicates the U.S. competitive position in world markets may be getting rapidly weaker. The study, which covered some 200 types of consumer goods, concludes that in foreign markets "our position has sharply deteriorated."

In addition to developments on the price front, there is some increasing concern over the makeup of U.S. trade statistics. Studies indicate the big surpluses of recent years reflect more than simply successful competition in the world markets. They also reflect such factors as Government grants and exports by U.S. companies to their foreign-based subsidiaries. One study, which scrutinized the trade figures for a recent year, found that a $5.4 billion trade surplus melted down to a $500 million surplus after such factors were discounted.

To be sure, it is by no means certain that Uncle Sam is about to lose his position as titan of world trade. It is not clear, for instance, that the recent jump in U.S. export prices signals a long-term trend or that Europe's drive against inflation will succeed. Nevertheless, the record of recent months suggests that continuing massive trade surpluses are by no means guaranteed. Without such surpluses, it is hardly necessary to add, this country's balance-of-payments problem, already worrisome, could become dire.

ALFRED L. MALABRE, Jr.

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS FLOWING FROM SUSPENDING THE IMPORT DUTY ON NICKEL

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHNEEBELI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to report to the House an article commenting on the beneficial effects flowing from our recent congressional action in suspending the import duty on nickel. Following House approval of this legislation, the unanimous vote by the Senate, and the approving signature of the President, the Canadian exporters passed along by a price cut the entire amount of the suspended duty of 1¼ cents per pound. This action "removes the price disadvantage previously borne by customers in the United States."

The entire article, from the Wall Street Journal of September 29, follows:

CANADIAN NICKEL FIRMS PASS ON U.S. PRICE CUT FROM TARIFF SUSPENSION—INTERNATIONAL NICKEL, FALCONBRIDGE, SHERRITT GORDON LOWER QUOTE FOR METAL BY 1¼ CENTS A POUND

TORONTO.—Major Canadian producers of nickel are passing on to U.S. customers the price cut of 1¼ cents a pound (United States) on imported nickel resulting from the suspension by the U.S. Government of a tariff in that amount.

The action follows legislation signed by President Johnson suspending until June 30, 1967, the duty on U.S. nickel imports.

International Nickel Co. of Canada, Falconbridge Nickel Mines, Ltd., and Sherritt Gordon Mines, Ltd., announced that base prices for refined nickel sold to U.S. customers would be 77¾ cents a pound (U.S. funds) at Canadian refineries. The cost of nickel to American industry had been 79 cents a pound, including the tariff.

H. S. Wingate, chairman of International Nickel, said the passing along of the duty suspension removes the price disadvantage previously borne by customers in the United States.

W. G. Dahl, vice president, marketing, for Falconbridge, said the entrance of duty-free nickel into the United States, which accounts for about half of the free world nickel consumption, would be particularly welcomed by users in highly competitive U.S. industries.

Prices for certain of International Nickel's other forms of imported primary nickel, such as nickel oxide sinter, which are already duty free, are unaffected, Mr. Wingate said.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine from Atlanta, Ga., S. S. Wachter, forwarded the "Highlights of U.S. History" to me, which I have read with a great deal of interest.

I am taking the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD, so as to make it available to my colleagues. Although a satire, it rings a bell:

[From the Belmond Independent, via the Guthrian, Guthrie Center, Iowa]

HIGHLIGHTS OF U.S. HISTORY

It came to pass that Columbus and his men put their ships to the west, into the darkness of the great ocean and sailed many days. And they came upon a great land, which none before had seen.

Said they, this looks like a darned good land. Let us therefore abide here and till the soil, labor in the vineyards and tend our kine and sheep that we may eat and drink thereof and prosper.

And they did, and called the land the United States of America.

Said they, let us call our brethren to join us, that they may prosper, too. Came they—Abraham, Sven, Patrick, Heinrich, Pierre, Ivan, Toivo, Lugi, and many others and their wives and children.

Tilled they the soil, labored in the vineyards, tended the kine and sheep. Went some to the mills and factories, and some traded goods one with the other, and they prospered and begat children who likewise prospered.

The land grew great and the Lord looked down upon the people and blessed them.

But lo, one day a king in a distant land said, this is my land. Yea, each of ye shall pay taxes unto me. And he sent his soldiers into the land to dwell in their homes, eat, and drink of their substances, and harass them that they should pay their taxes unto him.

And they did. Cried Patrick, son of Henry, Yea, give unto me Liberty or give unto me Death. And the Americans drew their bows and cast their spears at the king's soldiers and drove them from the land.

Said the Americans, None of this royalty jazz for us. We will write a constitution to protect us from such tyrants and guide us in our deeds, each unto the other. And we shall choose one of us to be President, as we shall have a council called Congress which shall forever hearken unto us, the people, alone.

And we shall have States and Governors and legislatures, and the people's rights, liberty, and freedom from tyranny and high taxes shall prevail forever.

Chose they George, son of Washington, as the first President, and others chose they as Congressmen and Senators to hearken only unto them.

And George said unto Congress and it unto them, yea, let us not levy heavy taxes nor meddle in the people's affairs, that they be self reliant, thrifty and prosperous. And, it was so for many years and the Lord looked down upon them and blessed them.

But, lo, troubles beset the land, and it was called the depression. And the President, who then was Franklin, son of Roosevelt, said, Yea, let us pass some temporary laws which we shall call priming the pump. And let us spend our competence that we may be prosperous.

Gave he rakes and spades to the youth of the land and said he, go ye forth and gather up the fallen leaves, cut ye the long grass and burn it.

And said he unto the tillers of the soil, Take ye land out of production and ye shall be paid. Plow ye under your piggies and ye shall be paid. And this was called boondoggling, and the tillers knew not what to do and the youths leaned on their rakes and spades.

Behold, and came now Lyndon, son of Johnson, to be President.

Spake he unto Congress, which by now hearkened not unto the people, but only unto him. Let us build the Great Society in our own image that we shall get the people's votes and preserve our dynasty forever.

Said he further, the people know not what is good for them, nor the Governors nor the legislatures, but we do, Hearken ye not to their babblings, but do ye as I say, d'y all hear? and they heard.

And said Lyndon, We shall be thrifty, and I personally shall turn out the lights in the White House, that we waste no shekels.

And said he, We shall have a war on poverty, yea though I say unto you we are more prosperous now than ever before. We shall take from them that hath and give to them that hath not, yea, that all Americans shall be rich, though they sweat not their brows.

And said Lyndon, Let there be no right-to-work laws, that the people who want jobs can go unto the union bosses who supported me in the election that they can wax powerful throughout the land.

And we shall have medicare, civil rights, and we shall pretty up the country that there be no billboards or auto graveyards along the roads.

Spake he of peace, even as he warred. Yea, many were the deeds and words of Lyndon, and they cost the Americans many shekels.

Again, as had their forefathers before them, they grumbled at the taxes. And to keep them quiet cast he them some excise tax cuts even as he raised the debt limit to 329 billion shekels.

And many sang the praises of Lyndon, and he was pleased, because it meant votes and preservation of the dynasty, even unto HUBERT, son of HUMPHREY; yea, though BOBBY, son of KENNEDY and brother of Jack, looked not with favor upon HUBERT.

Yea, as they hearkened unto Lyndon, the Americans were confused and divided. They knew not whether they prospered or hungered and whether they were at peace or at war, and they wondered what was to become of them.

And the Lord looked down upon the Americans and wondered what in hell had happened to them.

LABOR SECRETARY'S STUBBORNNESS EXPENSIVE TO NEW HAMPSHIRE APPLE CROP

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the hardheaded policies of the Labor Secretary in refusing until the last possible minute to permit the customary use of Canadian labor to harvest apples in New Hampshire has taken a heavy toll. The crop is being harvested, it is true, and most orchards in my State expect it to be on time. But industry sources tell me that the harvest this year will be about 1.25 million bushels instead of the anticipated 1.75 million bushels. This is being blamed, in large measure, on the labor shortage. And, because experienced hands were in short supply, an undetermined number of apples have been bruised or mishandled so that the usual quantity of top-grade apples has been reduced.

The whole episode has been like something out of the old "Perils of Pauline" silent movie serials. The innocent, trusting heroine, in this case the apple industry, and the villain with his smooth and easy promises, in this case the Labor Department, are present in this plot, too. The great difference is that in the old movies Pauline was rescued at the last moment by the handsome hero, but in this case, the last-minute rescuer was the Labor Secretary himself who came galloping up in hastily donned hero's clothes to save the day from a situation of his own creation.

The apple industry and workers of New Hampshire will not soon forget or lightly treat the pushing around they received from their Government this year. It has been an expensive lesson in civics as practiced in the so-called Great Society.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert an article from the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader, dated September 23, 1965. It describes the difficulties of one of our leading apple growers, Edward C. Leadbeater of Contoocook, who took the Government at its word and tried his best to comply with the desires of the Secretary of Labor. I think it will interest other Members.

The article follows:

HARVEST IS FAR BEHIND; VOLUNTEER RUINS 10 BUSHELS—DISASTER NEAR FOR APPLE GROWER

(By Fred E. Beane)

CONTOOCOOK.—Quick, mother, the aspirin bottle, and be sure there's a handful of them. This certainly was what Edward C. Leadbeater of this township, prominent apple grower, was thinking, if not yelling, yesterday morning, as he faced another discouraging day of hot apple-cooking weather, and a scarcity of apple pickers capable of turning a young man's hair white.

The farm editor had chugged up steep Gould Hill, tongue out with the heat, to find "Ed" hotter than the weather over his acute shortage of apple pickers, the promise of at least 2 more days of baked-apple heat, the threat of heavy thundershowers, wind and possible hail, and associated problems. Ordinarily he's a cool gent, indeed.

OUT HE GOES

Out of the car we found him in the process of "discharging" another inexperienced apple picker, a tall, strong, willing gent, who agreed he'd probably tried to yank the apples off too vigorously. He needed the money, he said, but didn't seem to be able to apply the rules that keep the apple quality. He had picked 10 bushels in 1 hour, as a green hand, and "Ed" was telling him "he'd bruised and punctured practically all of them."

Orchardist Leadbeater and Dr. C. A. "Kelly" Langer, the UNH apple fieldman, had publicly invited all the news media in the area—dailies, weeklies, radio, and television—to climb atop Gould Hill for a personal look at the harvest mess that too many orchardists have been in for too many weeks. No other news broadcaster had showed up. But we were there, and on went the tour, despite the lack of numbers.

The helicopter man from Norwood, Mass., was charging over his orchards, at his command, raining down a thin mist spray of "stick-on" hormone material, hoping to "anchor" some of the apples a while longer against the dangers of storm, hail, heat and wind, "Ed's" staff of year-round workers, and some special local help, were rushing about the packing shed and orchards.

GIVES REVIEW

Finally we got "Ed" away from his fruitless attempt to solve his headaches and into a frame of mind to describe them to us. He's bitter, he agreed, but not to chastise anybody personally for the mess the harvest is in. He said, however, that as long ago as last December, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was warning that he wouldn't allow trained apple pickers to be brought down from Canada for this emergency job.

So, to date, "Ed" has made "no attempt" to book Canadians, who he has had in sizable numbers there past years. For them he maintains a 30-bed barracks and modern kitchen, in which, right now, he has one sole dweller, a Canadian who has won his permanent visa and is so valuable an apple man he's being used as a trainer and supervisor of "drift in" help.

Envious of fellow growers in the State, a few of whom seem to have solved their harvest problem either with nearby servicemen or repeater crews from the Deep South, "Ed" determined to apply the Wirtz "no Canadians" decree.

He booked a dozen students from New England College, with the promise of a full week of work ahead of the college's opening day. He contacted a recruiter in Canada, with a promise of a 15-man crew of Indian apple pickers who can come across the border at will. He also had some assurances that after college started at Henniker, he likely could have some 32 part-time student workers. What happened?

The "before school" boys found themselves piled up with college duties, and could come only part time, but did good work. Instead of 32 for part time, he had no more than 15 for lesser time.

The Indians? All recruited, they were contacted by an Aroostook potato grower who in desperation promised "fabulous" wages, and they left overnight for northeast Maine, instead of New Hampshire. Now he'll get no Indians, "Ed" is sure.

SLOW RESULTS

The results? Leadbeater describes it. By using home folks, neighbors, folks who drop in, idle workers recruited by Employment Service contact men, and trying out, with constant frustration, any real prospect showing up on the hill, he's now taking off no more than 600 to 800 bushels, instead of the 1,200 to 1,600 bushels which a Canadian crew would have made possible.

Add to this, they said, the fact that last weekend came up with a Sunday of rain, and only 400 boxes picked, and you have his picture, his headache, and need for aspirin to be taken by the handful.

Every day, he said, many pickers fail to show up. They may come again but he never knows. Many come, try out the chore, and quit. Some try but have to be let go, because they break trees, knock down the apples with careless ladder handling, and throw fancy fruit into culls for lack of stems, or bruises. Women come in to work, he said, but simply cannot handle a 20-foot ladder.

"Ed" expects from now until mid-October to be hectic days for him. There will be headaches and the threat of ulcers and white hair, he fears.

How he'll get the harvest accomplished, he says, is still a conundrum at best. He'll keep the pickers he has busy as many hours as they'll work. He'll hunt new help. He'll try out any real prospects.

Today, he has a 25,000 or better apple crop of the highest quality fruit that a well air-drained hilltop orchard can produce. He has the help needed to handle it in his receiving and packing shed. He has a 25,000-bushel cold storage plant at Penacook in which to house the apples.

His problem, of course, is to get them picked, and the extreme heat now threatens a sizable loss "by dropping." This would happen in jig time, if there is a windstorm or heavy rain, and there always is the threat of hail damage.

Had "Ed" been able to get his corps of 30 experienced Canadian apple pickers, he would have no harvest worry. They would have picked the apples in jig time and with proper care.

Instead, today, he has one sole occupant of his 30-bed dormitory investment, who is living there alone and is mighty lonesome. He's Horace Regan, originally from New Brunswick, now of Vanceboro, Maine. He's capable of taking 80 or more bushels a day off the trees.

But is he picking? He is not, for "Ed" needs a capable man to try to teach and supervise any inexperienced pickers he lets into his orchards. So Horace is an inspector and teacher, not expected to pick a bushel of fruit the whole harvest season.

In the meantime, the orchard harvest help recruiters which the Employment Service folks have in the field trying, with too little success, to scurry up some acceptable help, are really getting a lesson in the problem. We listened to one of them telling "Ed" he'd had a liberal education. He's found that not everybody can pick apples.

As we left, "Ed" was recalling that he, along with all New Hampshire orchardists, had "blown his top" at a government suggestion that they call on the ablebodies from mental institutions to yank off the apples.

The paradox is, he confessed, he has "one such picker," brought along by an attendant with a few days off. And the two have proven to be among the best pickers on the premises. Mental hygiene and apple picking, says "Ed," might yet prove at least a partial key to the Willard Wirtz ultimatums.

DISTORTED TRADE STATISTICS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to bring before the Members of this House a matter that I think will be recognized as being of great impor-

tance, especially as it bears on our foreign trade policy and the balance-of-payments equation.

I refer to what has been a longtime practice in the statistical treatment of our imports. This practice has led to a distortion of the balance of trade between this country and the other leading trading nations; and the distortion is important enough to affect policies and actions that may be shaped or modifie by statistical data.

We hear a great deal, for example, about our favorable trade balance in the form of export surpluses from year to year. The matter to which I refer should lead to greater caution in statistical use, and even to a change in the collection and publishing of these statistics.

Only in recent times has it come to be noticed that the United States uses a different basis for reporting its imports from that followed by nearly all other countries of the world. We record our imports to reflect the f.o.b. value, foreign point of shipment, whereas nearly all other countries report their imports on c.i.f. or port of entry basis. They add to the f.o.b., foreign port of export, the freight and insurance charges incident to shipment to their own ports of entry from abroad. This is the method referred to as c.i.f.—cost, insurance, and freight.

As a result when we export $1 million, let us say, to Britain, their import figure, covering the identical merchandise, will record the imports at some $1.2 million, by adding costs of insurance and freight from U.S. port of export to England. This will be some $200,000 higher than our records show as exports; while if Britain ships us $1 million in merchandise we record it as $1 million and not at $1.2 million or some similar figure.

It has not been possible to compute precisely the amount of the distortion caused by these different bases of recording imports. However, we have some statistics on total imports of particular countries from this country, and these import figures may be matched with our recorded exports to those same countries.

For example, in 1963, according to our official Commerce Department statistics, we exported to Japan a total of $1,714 million in merchandise. Japan recorded imports during the same year from the United States at $2,077 million, or $363 million more than our exports. While the cutoff date at each end of the year will find shipments at sea in both directions, the distortion cannot be very large. The $363 million can be regarded as representing approximately the shipping charges and insurance from the United States to Japan, or 21.2 percent more than our export statistics show. In 1964, using the c.i.f. basis, Japan recorded our exports of $1,908 million as imports of $2,336 million from this country, or 22.4 percent higher than our recorded exports.

According to our own statistics this country exported $1,714 million to Japan in 1963 while we imported $1,498 million from Japan. Were our import statistics recorded on a c.i.f.—cost, insurance, and freight—basis and, assuming shipping and insurance charges on the eastward voyage from Japan to the United States to be the same as on the westward voyage, we would increase our import figures from Japan by 21.2 percent of the total of $1,498 million. The total would then have been $1,815 million. In other words, the United States would have recorded an adverse balance in trade with Japan in the magnitude of $101 million instead of showing a surplus of exports in the amount of $216 million, as recorded in our official statistics.

If we turn again to 1964 we find a similar distortion. According to our official trade statistics we exported to Japan $1,908 million in that year while we imported $1,769 million giving us a surplus in exports of $139 million. If, however, we bring our f.o.b.—foreign port—level up to the c.i.f. value, again using the difference already referred to—this time 22.4 percent as representing the difference between f.o.b. and c.i.f.—we find the imports of $1,769 from Japan rising to $2,165 million, leaving us with an adverse merchandise balance of $257 million instead of a surplus of $139 million.

Mr. Speaker, to me this transformation of the United States from a surplus to a substantial deficit position in our trade with Japan is a serious matter. The public, including all of us, have been fed with the impression that our exports to Japan have exceeded our imports from Japan, year after year. Japan apparently, despite her valiant struggle, had not been able to square her trade with us.

This distortion of fact, indefensible as it is, undoubtedly colored our trade policy vis-a-vis Japan. We pride ourselves on being guided by the facts. This is all the more reason why we should be careful of the data on which we rely. There is a great onus on our executive departments that collect and disseminate statistics, to assure the accuracy and integrity of all the statistical data they give out because we seldom have other sources and, therefore, must rely on the Government.

If we turn from Japan to the United Kingdom we find a similar distortion. The United Kingdom, like Japan, computes its import statistics on the foreign sales price plus shipping costs and insurance from the foreign point of shipment to the English port.

If we match our exports, f.o.b., United States, as recorded in our official statistics, with the United Kingdom's recording of these same imports for the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, we find that the British after adding shipping costs and insurance from this country, recorded her imports from us at a higher average level for the 3 years of 22 percent.

Our exports of $1,074 million to the United Kingdom in 1962 were recorded at $1,334 million in the official statistics of that country. This was 24.1 percent higher than our exports. The excess of the British imports according to the British method of recording imports was, therefore, $260 million.

However, if we add 24.1 percent to our imports of $1,005 million from the United Kingdom in 1962, they would reach a level of $1,247 million, or $173 million more than our exports of $1,074 million to that country.

Yet, the impression has been widespread that Britain has been suffering from a substantial adverse merchandise trade balance with this country.

In 1963 there was an apparent British deficit of $387 million in her trade with us; but if we enhance our imports from there by 20 percent—which was the difference attributable to insurance and freight in 1963—they will reach a level of $1,295 million compared with our exports of $1,161 million. This would show an adverse U.S. balance of $134 million.

For 1964 our exports were $1,468, recorded by the British at $1,790 by adding shipping costs and insurance. According to this result the British deficit was $322 million. We recorded our imports from Britain at $1,141 million. If we add 22 percent, which measures the British markup attributable to the c.i.f. basis she uses, our imports from that country would have been $1,392, instead of $1,141 as recorded by us, leaving us this time with a merchandise export surplus, but one of only $76 million instead of $322 million, as figured by the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, the average markup on our imports from Japan and the United Kingdom would be 22.9 percent for the 3 years of 1962–64 if we undertook to bring our import statistics to a par with those of nearly all the other countries, assuming that insurance, freight, and other shipping charges from all other countries were the same on the average as from England and Japan. This, however, is not the case. Obviously the charges applicable to shipments from Canada and Mexico would be very much lower.

Since these two countries account for 20 percent of our imports this share should be averaged in at close to zero. If we use zero for them, as if no freight or insurance charges were applicable to imports from them, the 22.9 percent would be reduced by one-fifth—20 percent.

Inasmuch as the remaining countries—with the exception of Cuba, with which we have only a very small amount of trade—lie a considerable distance from us, some of them farther away than England or Japan, it would seem safe to accept the figure of 22.9 percent minus 20 percent. The remainder would be 18.3 percent, applicable to imports as a global average.

To be on the safe side, we might settle for 17½ percent.

That this is far from being an insignificant factor in our merchandise trade balance will become obvious as soon as we apply it to our total imports. These were recorded at $18.68 billion in 1964.

If we enhance them by 17½ percent we arrive at an additional $3.25 billion. Added to $18.68 billion, the total would be $21.93 billion. This would put our imports on a comparable basis with those of nearly all other countries. Our 1964 exports were $25.6 billion, thus casting a surplus of $6.9 billion under the

official system of recording imports adhered to by the Department of Commerce. If the correction is made the surplus shrinks to $3.65 billion.

This reduced surplus is then not the towering factor in our balance of payments that it has been widely acclaimed as being. It is only half of the magnitude generally assigned to it.

This serious shrinkage of a plus factor in our merchandise trade balance resulting from abandonment of an untenable method of measuring our imports has other implications.

It flatly contradicts the perennial claim that American industry is indeed highly competitive in foreign markets, as witness our huge export surpluses. This inflated balloon is now deflated beyond hope of reflation.

I have previously pointed out to this House that our export of subsidized farm products—wheat, wheat flour, rice, cotton, and dairy products—has been at a level of some $2.3 billion. Most of these shipments were made under the AID program. Of this $2.3 billion we shipped $1.38 billion during the fiscal year 1963–64 in the form of wheat, wheat flour, cotton, rice, dairy products, tobacco, and oilseed products with export payments, over and above AID exports. These were classified as "commercial exports," by the Department of Commerce even though they were subsidized. These shipments have been treated as separate from governmentally assisted exports and not reported under that classification, thus making our commercial exports look better than they should. See Foreign Agricultural Trade, May 1965, U.S. Department of Agriculture, table 1, page 7.

In 1964 we shipped additionally $1.4 billion in nonagricultural merchandise financed by U.S. Government grants and capital. See Foreign Agricultural Trade, July 1965, U.S. Department of Agriculture, table 1, page 8. Added to the $2.3 billion of U.S. Government financed exports of agricultural products, the total rises to $3.7 billion. This then neatly wipes out the $3.65 billion of surplus exports to which the $6.9 billion had shrunk after our imports were placed on a c.i.f. basis.

Mr. Speaker, the upshot is that the United States does not enjoy an export surplus at all if we count only our private commercial unsubsidized exports; and it is these exports that measure our competitive status in the world.

The stimulation of our exports of agricultural products by subsidies and grants has hidden the lag in our exports of manufactured goods with the exception of machinery. Our exports of machinery, stimulated by our fast-growing foreign investments, rose from $3.95 billion in 1957 to $6.3 billion in 1963, a gain of $2.5 billion. This more than equaled the increase of $2.1 in our total exports during the same period.

Considering the increase in agricultural exports and that of machinery, it is obvious that our exports of other manufactured goods combined must have shrunk. These other exports cover the whole spectrum of American industry. Some of these others did increase, helped by AID shipments, but our private unsubsidized commercial exports in general, with the exception of machinery, declined.

This is the situation and it is at complete variance with the official statistics on which optimistic statements continue to be based.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on trade statistics but am fully confident that the statistics I have presented are reliable. They were supplied by Mr. O. R. Strackbein who is chairman of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. His knowledge in this field needs no affirmation by me, and his reputation for accuracy of the data supplied by him has not been questioned to my knowledge over the years. I have no hesitation in relying on his researches.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution designed to cure the distortion of statistics of which we have been the victims. I think we in Congress no less than the public are entitled to get our statistics straight. Too much rides on conclusions drawn from them to continue to submit to the dangers of false guidance. False and unjustifiable policies are too prevalent as it is. We do not need false statistics to encourage and bolster them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I should like to compliment the gentleman on taking the time to appear in the well of the House at this time of the day to bring this very important subject before the House and before the Nation. As I understand, this deals with the statistical way of reporting imports in some countries, and exports in others, and the treatment of each, as differentiated from the way that our Department of Commerce treats our calculation of exports and imports.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. HALL. I believe it is most noteworthy that the gentleman brings this to our attention. Of course, until such time as we can at least "figure," as we say down in the Ozarks, in the same way that our competitors around the world in international trade are calculating exports and imports, we certainly cannot expect to meet their requirements, we certainly cannot expect to "out figure" the European Common Market, and we certainly cannot expect to tear down all of our protective tariffs as we did under the reciprocal trade agreements of 1962 and not have an outflow of gold and an imbalance of trade in favor of the other nations around the world.

This is a most timely and important subject, and I compliment the gentleman for bringing this to the attention of the House. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his kind comment.

CANADIAN BUSINESS BONANZA COMING FROM AUTO PARTS PACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded this day of the old nursery rhyme which went something like this:

When the wind blows, the cradle will rock and when the bough breaks the cradle will fall.

This thought came to mind as I read the attached editorial in the Financial Post from Toronto, Canada.

I see in this editorial the evils and dangerous winds of national and personal interest; the destructive tornadoes of selfishness and greed. I can see in the days to come the tumbling down of the cradle of sweet trade dreams that our unrealistic trade experts have been nursing and rocking slowly and snugly for the last two decades.

For myself, the truth holds no terrors. Long ago I came to the conclusion that if men can learn to live together, they can and eventually will go far enough in a civilized state to live in peace with one another. However, the free trade, unselfish, nonprofit, nongreed, and non-personal-interest dreamworld of the free-traders will never happen while two men are alive and private enterprise is still a way of life.

If we are prepared—worldwide—to let our State Department and Commerce officials set the pace for world relations we can then hope to have at least a warning of which industry is to be washed down the drain of free trade.

I am afraid auto parts, autos, and electrical appliances are next on the list of expendables to be fed to the profiteering internationalist trader and cartel entrepreneur.

Have you noticed the stirring in Europe and Japan looking toward the auto parts pact we signed with Canada? It will tear down our American industrial independence. This is the beginning of the end of the U.S. auto industry's mighty growth pattern. The experts in both labor and management say "No." Commonsense and the glass, coal, ceramics, steel, electronics, textile, and other import-injured industries say "Yes." They have our adverse trade record to back them up.

A funny thing about all of the free trade wind blowers is that, to a man, they are the first to line up for higher personal pay and profits and yet every deal in foreign trade drives another nail into our high economy coffin.

Scratch the personal profit interest of a free trader and he bleeds like a protectionist. American industry is moving to every cheap labor country in the world in the name of free trade, peace, brotherly love, and one-world good will.

BONANZA

Mr. Speaker, the following headlines in a leading Canadian newspaper tell the story of our auto and parts trade pact more eloquently than anything I might say. I quote headlines from the Financial Post—Toronto, Canada:

"Preview of Business Bonanza Coming From Auto Parts Pact," "Budd Co. Car Frames Plant," "Exports of Cars Rise 10 Percent in 6 Months," Steel Boom of 500,000 Tons," "Exports of Engines Are Up 91 percent," "Body Stampings Made

in Canada," "Some 11,000 New Jobs Already."

Following the bold proclamation of prosperity for Canadian taxpayers the story goes on to relate some of the events and promises that are the causes for the publication:

Some of the enormous benefits to the Canadian economy from the Canada-United States auto parts plan are coming into view.

Promised new jobs and spending have started to take measurable form.

This week FP talked with scores of top executives to put together an early preview of the bonanza that will begin as soon as the U.S. Senate okays the pact.

Here is how things are shaping up:

At least 20 plants are in the planning stages and as many existing plants are being expanded to meet the sharply rising requirements of the automobile manufacturers during the next several years, FP understands.

This growth may mean at least 5 million square feet of new plant space.

The projects cover a wide range of materials—various types of steel, synthetic fibers, plastics, rubber, chemicals, paints—and hundreds of auto parts ranging from screws to 250-pound metal auto frames.

The extra capacity will be needed to enable the auto makers to boost the Canadian value-added content of their vehicles in line with commitments already given Ottawa.

Canadian steelmakers see a potential additional market of 400,000 to 500,000 tons a year opening up as a result of the expanded auto program.

The extra steel will go into dozens of applications including the two biggest: auto frames and heavy body stampings.

Several major U.S. auto parts manufacturers, working quietly behind the scenes, have multimillion-dollar projects ready for early unveiling.

Budd Co., Philadelphia, one of the largest auto parts manufacturers in the United States, has plans well advanced to establish an estimated $12 to $14 million plant for first Canadian manufacturers of auto frames, FP understands. The big new plant appears slated for Kitchener, Ontario.

Budd operates seven plants in the United States and, through its international division, holds a direct financial interest in companies in France, West Germany, Canada, Australia, Argentina and Mexico.

Its Canadian undertaking—one of the largest in the auto parts program—likely would have to be based on the guaranteed frame requirements of at least two of the major automakers.

All motor vehicle frames are now imported from the United States. With Canadian vehicle manufacture estimated at around a record 750,000 units this year this represents an additional steel market of close to 100,000 tons a year.

Installation of heavy stamping facilities in Canada to handle the big auto-body stampings—all now done in the United States, hoods, deck lids and roof sections—are expected to follow later.

Both Algoma Steel Corp. and Steel Co. of Canada recently completed new cold-rolled sheet plants capable of turning out sheets wide enough for those applications.

Exports of Canadian-built passenger automobiles and chassis were up 103 percent in the first 6 months this year:

6 months to June 30	1965	1964
	$70,524,198	$34,677,503

Exports of motor vehicle parts and accessories (NES) were up 107 percent in first 6 months this year:

6 months to June 30	1965	1964
	$51,034,791	$24,703,412

Exports of motor vehicle engines and parts were up 91 percent in first 6 months this year:

6 months to June 30	1965	1964
	$21,902,151	$11,483,396

In June 1965 the number of jobs in auto manufacturing was up 7,000 from same time last year. The number of jobs in auto-parts manufacturing was up 4,000.

Until the last 2 years the auto market for Canadian steel was taking an estimated 8 to 9 percent of total domestic production. The 1966 models are estimated to absorb approximately 14 percent of total steel output. By 1968 the proportion is expected to climb to around 18 percent. In the United States, the auto market represents around 20 percent of the steel market.

But the expanded auto market has major operational implications for Canadian steelmakers as well. It is expected to cushion domestic operations to a greater extent from the traditional year-to-year fluctuations in the market. More important still, it will help balance out operations throughout the entire year. With heaviest steel requirements from the automakers coming in the late fall and winter months, this will help counterbalance the seasonal winter dip in demand from the construction industry.

Auto parts makers, mostly U.S.-controlled, have several options in their expansion plans. They can set up, or expand, plants in Canada to take care of just the increased Canadian market or the total indicated North American market. Or they can expand existing facilities in the United States to take care of the entire North American market. But they can only complete their plans once the major auto companies indicate the direction of their own plans.

Kelsey Wheel Co., for instance, has started first export—for 1966 models—of Canadian-made wheels from its expanded Windsor, Ontario, plant.

General Motors of Canada is also exporting for the first time Canadian-made interior auto trim from its recently completed Windsor plant.

Canadian manufacturers of coated fabrics have expanded their facilities to be ready for an indicated boost in the auto interior market (Canadian Industries Ltd., Canadian General Tower, Monsanto Canada Ltd., and Shawinigan Chemicals Ltd.).

But the big automakers are maintaining tight secrecy on some of their plans for boosting Canadian content. For one thing they want to be absolutely certain the auto pact clears the U.S. Senate. And for another, they still have not fully mapped out all their own moves.

In attaining their Canadian-value-added commitments, Ottawa is permitting the auto companies credit for exports of Canadian-made cars and/or parts. This poses major decisions for the automakers.

Ford Motor Co. of Canada and Chrysler Canada, Ltd., with some expansion plans already underway or announced, have already provided some indications of the direction of their program. But General Motors is maintaining utmost secrecy to date on its forward planning. Although Ford and Chrysler are substantially boosting Canadian-made content in the 1966 models, General Motors is believed to be sitting tight. And if GM does not place its expected boosted orders within the next couple of months they will be too late to be incorporated in the 1967 models.

GM has undertaken an additional Canadian-value-added of $121 million; Ford, $74.2 million; Chrysler, $33 million, and American Motors, $11.2 million.

The big auto-parts program has already swung into high gear and the Canadian content of 1966 models—without benefit of export—is estimated at around 70 percent. The proportion was around 60 percent last year. By 1968—if the auto pact is soon cleared—the proportion should rise to around 80 percent.

One has to look into all of the ramifications of an industrial complex to realize the severe blow struck to our economy by this ill-conceived so called free trade deal.

Watch the moves of the auxiliary producers who provide the many smaller but integral parts of an auto. It takes more than a frame and a motor to build a motor car.

Today we note that within 6 months 11,000 new jobs have been created in auto and parts plants in Canada—less than 6 months after the announcement of the trade pact. This is only a fraction of the total impact of new jobs created.

There are so many more jobs in services and supplies alined with the auto industry that a figure of at least 40,000 new jobs would be closer to the truth.

For instance the new homes, the added power, fuel, transportation, food services and supplies add up to an average job growth of 2.75 new jobs for every job created in a production plant.

This is true in any industrial complex and is low when you consider that a 1,000-job plant will sustain a community of 7,500 persons.

To prove this statement one needs only to review the following lists of factory expansions traced directly to the auto trade deal.

These new jobs are added to the auto and engine plants expansions:

TINY TALBOTVILLE IS KEY IN OPTION GAME

(By David Crane)

They're playing a new game in the London, Ontario, area. It's called "Who's got the option?"

As in many southwestern Ontario communities, those in the London area are looking forward to the passage of the Canada-United States auto pact. They all have high hopes for new plants and plant expansions in the auto and auto-parts industries.

But until the pact is actually passed and signed by President Johnson not many auto or auto-parts companies want to commit themselves to a definite project.

Hense the mysterious process whereby unidentified executives quietly visit communities and look over plant sites, then send in real estate agents to pick up options for unnamed clients.

And thus all the mystery in Talbotville, a small community near London and St. Thomas. Last July Toronto realtor W. H. Bosley Co., picked up a 30-day option for more than 1,500 acres in Talbotville for an unnamed client.

Immediate results: speculation, second guessing, long-distance phone calls to automarkers' head offices in Detroit, a cold curtain of silence by industry and government officials, and an unbelievable increase in land values in the surrounding area.

And to add to the mystery—or perhaps to confirm the speculation—Bosley renewed its option for another 30 days when the auto plan failed to get through the U.S. legislative mill at the beginning of this month. The pact is expected to be passed this month.

On the basis of their own inside information, most speculators say Ford Motor Co. of Canada plans to build a $75-million plant to employ 3,000 to 5,000 workers.

But speculation breeds speculation:

Hundreds of real estate schemes are on the drawing boards. One realtor last week even

claimed he would build a $50-million housing project in St. Thomas that includes apartments, individual homes, and an 18-hole golf course. No details were provided on what backing the scheme has.

Canadian National Railways has just bought the 25-mile London & Port Stanley Railway, which had been up for sale for many years with no buyer in sight.

Rumors abound that CN has approached local farmers for a right-of-way for a spur line to the optioned Talbotville land.

Land values have shot up from $300 to $600 an acre to $2,000 to $3,000 within the last few months.

Real estate agents in London are said to be calling on owners of $100,000 homes to see whether they are interested in selling to executives who want to live in the London area.

As for Talbotville, a community of two gas stations, a diner, an old church, variety store, and small cemetery, people there are just watching the price of land go up, and up, and up.

I add a few listed expansions direct from Canadian reports:

AUTO PARTS EXPANSIONS

Here are 15 auto supplier companies that have already completed or announced major expansion programs:

Kelsey Wheel Co., Windsor, Ontario: Auto wheels.

S.K.D. Manufacturing Co., Amherstburg, Ontario: Stampings.

Canadian Motor Lamp Co., Windsor: Headlights.

Canadian Filters Ltd., Chatham, Ontario: Filters.

General Spring Products Ltd., Kitchener, Ontario: Springs.

Sehl Engineering Ltd., Kitchener: Stampings.

Thompson Products Ltd., St. Catharines, Ontario: Castings, connecting rods, forgings, power-steering assemblies.

McCord Corp., Orangeville, Ontario: Radiators.

Ontario Steel Products Co., Toronto: Bumpers, grilles, springs.

McKinnon Industries Ltd., St. Catharines: Axles, transmission casings, brake assemblies, ball bearings.

Blackstone Radiator, Stratford, Ontario: Radiators.

Windsor Bumper, Walkerville, Ontario: Bumpers.

Eaton Precision Instruments Ltd., Wallaceburg, Ontario: Carburetor parts.

Eaton Springs (Canada) Ltd., Chatham: Springs.

Harding Carpets, Ltd., Brantford, Ontario: Automobile carpet.

The arguments of the pro free traders always neglect the facts of life in a competitive world. They pooh-pooh any argument that holds wages to be a determining factor in the ability or nonability of a nation to compete in world trade.

Like most of the views put out by the pro free traders the issue of wages is one that has been hidden in a mass of conflicting percentages and figures most of which have little or no basis in fact.

The same Canadian source that claims the bonanza for Canada in the auto and parts deal warns Canadian labor leaders against attempts to gain wage parity with U.S. workers.

The warning is contained in an editorial which bluntly tells Canadian labor that if they fight for higher wages or for U.S. wage parity they will lose their competitive trade advantages.

My compliments to the editors of the Financial Post for their candidness and forthright statement. They make no bones about it—they admit that wages are the real determining factor in world trade and while Canadian wages enjoy the least advantage against U.S. wage levels in the whole auto and part producing world economy they know that even this small advantage—compared to Japan, Italy, England, Germany, and so forth—is enough to give Canada a tremendous trade advantage in our market; in world markets.

The truth cannot for too long be kept from the people and while only a few of us are bold enough to say it, the truth is, bluntly, "No nation can survive in a free trade world in competition with a lower waged or lower cost standard nation."

The editorial from the Canadian Financial Post follows:

OLD BATTLE HYMNS WON'T WORK NOW

The long-established ceremonial rituals of labor-management negotiations require that union leaders solemnly dust off old chestnuts, and fatten up current demands each year. Chief among these hoary requests, which the unionists themselves usually don't take very seriously, has for a very long time been "wage parity" with U.S. workers.

But equal pay for equal work on both sides of the border may now be boomed into a new prominence. Management would be well advised to think about the matter now.

Two reasons: Ottawa's new attempts to make Canadian manufacturing as efficient as U.S. manufacturing through such devices as the recent auto plan are actively encouraging demands for so-called wage parity. In addition, wage parity is more than idle talk among the unions in isolated industries, such as steel, where Canadian manufacturing efficiency is frequently up to or beyond U.S. efficiency.

There are other good, hard reasons, however, why the whole issue should be squelched. Canada's costs and prices reflect the special economic realities of a vast, thinly populated country. We can't suddenly afford U.S. wage rates and living standards when a company or even an industry reaches U.S. efficiency levels.

LOSING THE EDGE ON PRICES

Lower wage rates are the only edge Canada has in competing with foreign producers. We sometimes can ship over long distances, for instance, if we have the wage advantage. Take it away, and the wages and the jobs disappear.

The most striking of the arguments against wage parity are presented on page 17. Calculations made by University of Saskatchewan economist R. E. Olley demonstrate the extent to which made-in-Canada wage inflation is undermining this country's competitive position vis-a-vis the United States.

This is not good news either for Canadian labor or for management. But it is a fact of life which should encourage both to forget the old battle cries and devise new and better ways of working together to preserve markets, profits, jobs, and incomes.

ARTICLE BY JOHN SCHREINER

The talk of wage parity for Canadian workers with those in the United States is being revived by Ottawa's conditional free trade program in automobiles.

It is presumed this will permit a nationalization of North American car production that could lead to high worker productivity in Canadian automobile plants.

Canadian workers, it is expected, would then insist more strongly than ever on wages comparable with those paid in U.S. plants.

Many international unions have long demanded wage parity. It has been a bargaining proposal in the automobile industry for at least 15 years.

However, parity has never been an essential objective. Labor has used it as a bargaining lever to secure more prized objectives. Unions have generally recognized that parity could hardly be expected as long as Canadian productivity lagged behind that in similar U.S. plants.

Conditional free trade will change this picture. A spokesman for the United Automobile Workers (UAW) says:

"It should be possible to take very long strides toward full wage parity in our next set of negotiations—1967–68—with the automobile firms."

Steel is another industry where the parity demand is looming larger with each bargaining session. The United Steelworkers (USW) argue that the Canadian industry's productivity has passed the U.S. industry.

Management, for obvious economic reasons, will resist any new pressures. "I don't know if there would be a resistance to parity as such," a General Motors of Canada official says. "But there would be resistance to an increase in the cost of production."

Because Canadian wages often run 25-percent below comparable U.S. wages, parity could have a significant effect on costs. Last year, Massey-Ferguson Industries Ltd. was faced with a parity proposal during collective bargaining. The company says it would have a tough time competing for sales in the big American farm implement market if it paid parity wages. Its new Brantford combine plant, which serves both the Canadian and United States markets, is a lot farther from the U.S. market than the plants of many competitors. Without the wage differential to offset transportation costs, the Brantford plant would not be as competitive.

When labor speaks of parity, it has in mind parity between comparable economic regions of Canada and the United States—southern Ontario and northern United States for example. Markets are regional, not national, one labor economist says. For that reason unions argue for regional, but not necessarily national, parity.

It is recognized that parity within comparable regions or even industries would naturally spill over to other regions and industries. The labor movement is expected to rely on the major international unions, like UAW and USW, to spearhead the parity fight. The patterns set by those two unions influence most other industrial bargaining.

Currently, labor thinks of parity between the United States and Canada in simple dollars and cents, without taking the exchange rate or fringe benefits into account. Once simple parity is gained, those other adjustments can be sought, labor says.

The parity issue is not likely to cause any strikes in the immediate future, but Canadian moves toward free trade will move it higher up the list of items discussed at collective bargaining. The main lines of argument have been drawn in past bargaining sessions between key employers and unions.

LABOR

Wage parity should be granted if it is justified by productivity. On this ground, parity is justified in several industries—for example, steel and oil refineries.

USW officials have argued: "In 1960, Canadian steelworkers caught up with U.S. steelworkers. Both turned out a ton of steel in 10.6 man-hours * * * In 1962 the Canadian performance was even better: 9.1 man-hours per ton compared with 9.9 man-hours in the United States." (Union officials claim Canadian productivity has continued to improve.)

"Although Canada's steelworkers are now among the world's most efficient and productive, they are not the world's most highly

paid. The base rate in the United States is 23.5 cents an hour higher and there is a bigger increment between job classes as well."

J. R. Duncan, Canadian head of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union (OCAW), argues: "The productivity of the petroleum industry worker in Canada is higher than that of his counterpart in the United States by at least 10 percent and sometimes more."

MANAGEMENT

Steel Co. of Canada, in a submission to a conciliation board last year, conceded that productivity may well exceed that of the U.S. industry. As for union arguments based on productivity increases, we are not aware that any objective opinion has ever contended that company or industry figures are to be the governing factor. Average nationwide productivity increases have almost universally been accepted as the only appropriate criterion for wage increases related to productivity."

MANAGEMENT

Lower Canadian wage costs are essential to Canadian sales to the United States—even where a free trade arrangement exists.

There's been free trade in farm machinery since 1944. In spite of this, Massey-Ferguson might be in trouble selling to the big U.S. farm market if it paid parity wages. Its major competitors are much closer to markets.

"The wage differential has been a major factor in permitting Massey-Ferguson to overcome the financial advantages of its competitors and become a major company in the United States." If the firm were forced to pay parity wages, it would have to locate its manufacturing and assembly plants in key U.S. markets.

"The differential between Canadian and United States wage rates * * * exists to about the same degree throughout industry and for similar reasons—it determines to a great degree the Canadian manufacturer's ability to deliver a product in the U.S. market at a price competitive with products made in the United States," Massey-Ferguson says.

One can not help but note the secrecy, the hold-back, the hints of hush-hush movements awaiting the final approval by the Senate of the United States.

If the Senate of the United States will investigate and check the plans and programs for the auto and parts raids on American employment it may well find reasons enough to stop this deal before it gets out of hand and opens this Nation up as the dumping grounds for foreign cars from all Nations belonging to GATT under the most favored nations clause of our Trade Agreement Act of 1962.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND MEETING

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, acting in his capacity as a Governor of the International Monetary Fund, reported today at the annual Fund meeting. It is both significant and heartening that Secretary Fowler regards expanded monetary supplies as a matter of concern to the entire free world and not solely to the Group of Ten.

It is a pleasure for me to extend his remarks in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND U.S. GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

Fellow Governors of the International Monetary Fund, ladies and gentlemen. We are complimented by the presence in our Capital City of so many distinguished people, from so many nations throughout the world. With the addition of Zambia last week and of Malawi in July—to whom I extend my own and my country's hearty welcome—the Fund now numbers 103 countries.

Each of the annual meetings of the great organizations for international financial cooperation that we take part in leaves the world a little changed, and changed for the better. What we say each year rests upon what we have accomplished, and what we have learned, in another year of worldwide cooperation and constructive endeavor in the management of our financial and economic problems.

This year—my first as a Governor of the Fund—we can look back with special pride. During the year just past our processes of consultation and cooperation passed stern tests of their practical effectiveness. We are implementing a significant increase in IMF quotas. The general arrangements to borrow were twice called into operation and the participating countries have indicated that they are prepared to continue the arrangements if the Fund so requests.

I consequently look forward with confidence to continued progress in seeking a consensus on matters of very far reaching importance for all our countries, and for a long time ahead.

I hope that when we meet next year we will find ourselves near the final stages of policy agreement in the field of improved international monetary arrangements.

The United States regards the Fund as an essential part of international financial arrangements. Since the inception of the Fund large sums in dollars have been used by the Fund to accommodate drawings by other countries. Over the years, these dollars have been repaid to the Fund. In the last 2 years, my country has also drawn on the Fund. Our drawings have been, in large part, technical arrangements making possible the continued use of dollars in the settlement of the obligations of other countries with the Fund.

However, at the end of last July, the United States made a regular drawing of $300 million through which it acquired foreign currencies for its own use in financing international payments.

All of these events provide evidence that the availability of Fund resources is increasingly important for all of the Fund members, large or small, industrial or developing.

The economic health of the United States affects world economic health in many ways, but in no way more fundamentally than in the reflection of U.S. economic conditions in the strength of the dollar.

During the past year the value of the dollar—and therefore the value of that large part of the world's monetary reserves kept in dollars—was reinforced in two ways: continued vigorous and sound economic growth in the United States, and progress toward eliminating our balance-of-payments deficit.

In the fiscal year ending last June, national output increased by about $41 billion, equivalent to almost 5 percent in real terms, continuing the longest peacetime economic expansion we have known. Prospects for maintaining our forward momentum are favorable. Despite its record length of 55 months, the current expansion has remained remarkably well-balanced and free from inflationary distortions.

In our manufacturing sector, increases in productivity and in wages received have been sufficiently in harmony so that labor costs per unit of output over the past year have again been stable. Since 1960, our unit labor costs have declined by 3.3 percent. We calculate that the recent key settlement in the steel industry, provides increased wages and benefits over a 39-month period equivalent to a little over 3 percent per year. We are hopeful that this will help sustain a pattern of balance between wages and productivity in industry generally, and will be accompanied by a continuation of stable prices.

Under the stimulus of improved incentives and prospects for expanding markets, capital spending by private industry continues to move ahead vigorously, as it has over the past 3 years, providing assurance against strains on capacity.

In the light of this continued expansion in the domestic economy of the United States, it is particularly encouraging that I am also able to report a significant improvement in the U.S. balance-of-payments position since the announcement of President Johnson's program on February 10. In the second quarter of this year, we experienced a surplus of $119 million, seasonally adjusted, compared with deficits of $780 million in the first quarter and $1,551 million in the fourth quarter of 1964.

We do not by any means conclude from 3 months' data that our balance-of-payments problem has been solved. Over any short-term period, balance-of-payments accounts exaggerate the effects of particular transactions, whether these be favorable or unfavorable. On balance, we believe that our second quarter figures were distorted in a favorable direction.

I regard it as more prudent for us to look at the combined results of the first and second quarters of the calendar year. During the first half of 1965, our balance-of-payments position was much improved, although there was still a deficit. This amounted to $661 million in the 6-month period and represents an annual rate of about $1.3 billion.

The figures I have used are in terms of the regular deficit concept which has been used generally in recent years in our balance-of-payments accounting. This concept has been criticized in that it includes in our deficit additions to private balances of dollars which represent working balances and investments by private parties. As many of the Governors know we intend to report our balance-of-payments data on the official settlements basis as well as the usual form in order to make our figures more comparable with those of other countries. On the official settlements basis our deficit in the first half of the year, seasonally adjusted, was about $400 million, or an annual rate of $800 million.

This improvement gives us confidence that our efforts over several years, supplemented by a vigorous new attack on the problem proposed by President Johnson last February, are moving the United States toward the equilibrium we are determined to attain and sustain. Our programs will be vigorously pursued until we are certain that the conditions have been created in which equilibrium in our international accounts can be sustained. In this, it is clear that we have the support of the Congress and the U.S. public at large.

This brings us to the heart of the matter: Will the free world continue in the years

ahead to be able to increase the reserves in our international monetary system sufficiently and in season to be certain that the sound employment of the world's economic resources for growth and improvement is not crippled by inadequate financial means?

This question must be asked because in the future the world's reserve needs will no longer be met by U.S. deficits, and because in recent years additions to reserves have depended so heavily upon dollar outflows. The record is as follows:

The United States has supplied about three-quarters of the new reserves accumulated by the rest of the world since the end of 1958. Only about one-quarter of this increase came from new supplies of monetary gold and from the credit operations of the International Monetary Fund. We estimate that as of the end of 1964 more than a quarter of the official reserves of the rest of the world were held in the form of dollars.

Reserves deriving from the U.S. deficit grew in two forms—dollar balances held as such, and dollars acquired and converted into gold. The latter development, of course, resulted in a decline in U.S. reserves.

Thus, we have before us a problem of conflicting objectives. Resolution of this problem is of central importance to the United States and to the rest of the world:

(a) On the one hand there is the need to achieve and sustain equilibrium in the U.S. balance of payments, in order to preserve the integrity of the dollar at home and abroad, to the end that the dollar can continue to function as an essential part of the world's monetary system, and in order to arrest further drains on U.S. reserves, and

(b) On the other hand, there is the need to continue to supply additions to reserves for continued economic expansion and betterment in all our countries.

All our countries are fully committed to a policy of dynamic growth in a dynamic world economy. This means growing international trade, growing domestic supplies of money, growing national outputs, and growing real incomes and profits.

If this expansion is to occur it is reasonable to expect that the free world, including the United States, will, in the course of time, face growing needs for monetary reserves.

We can hardly expect that either the industrial nations that have experienced such reserve growth or the rest of the world can be satisfied very long to limit future growth in reserves to the very modest level of new monetary gold supplies and such limited increases as come from normal IMF drawings.

These are the principal considerations that led my Government to take the initiative in suggesting that it is now time to negotiate new monetary arrangements which will enable the nations of the world to deal with future demands upon the international monetary system.

It is not my intention in these remarks to comment on the substantive proposals and the issues that have already been set forth for us in the work of the Deputies of the Group of 10, the Ossola Group, and the reports of the International Monetary Fund. The process of attaining a general consensus on the best ways of providing additional reserve assets will take time and great effort.

I do, however, wish to draw your attention to some important objectives to keep in mind as we go forward with the work of improving the international monetary system.

1. As I have stated, we should not expect to rely upon the dollar to continue to supply the major part of the growth in world reserves. The responsibility for providing reserves should be shared. This means that other ways of creating reserve assets will be needed to provided assurance that their total will grow at a rate that will encourage a continuation of the impressive growth in world economic production and trade.

2. The adjustment of imbalance should be brought about firmly but smoothly, in order to avoid disrupting effects on other countries and on the system as a whole. And here I want to stress that it is of key importance for surplus countries to adjust their positions as well as for deficit countries to do so. The adjustment burden not only should not—realistically, it cannot—rest solely on deficit countries. In the field of medium-term credit, in which the Fund has a pre-eminent place, we should assure that there are adequate amounts of such credit available to enable the adjustment process to function in ways consistent with the economic and political realities of modern society.

3. We should, at the same time, perfect the defenses of the international monetary system against its vulnerability to massive destabilizing movements of funds. In this area, international monetary cooperation in general, and especially short-term credit facilities among major countries, are important.

As I have said before, in pursuing these objectives the United States is wedded to no specific plan. We are impressed with the wide variety of technical possibilities which have been developed in the writings of distinguished economists here and abroad. And we have, in addition to these plans, the extremely valuable exploration of basic issues that has been developed by the Study Group on the Creation of Reserve Assets, under the chairmanship of Mr. Rinaldo Ossola, of Italy. This report not only provides a useful guide to current concepts, but has brought out clearly that the obstacles to progress are not questions of technical ability to create reserve assets, but policy issues concerning how, when, and where to create and distribute them. The problem is to reconcile the objectives of governmental policies so as to find ways of making progress that will find broad support.

It is therefore appropriate and gratifying that the Ministers of the Group of Ten have decided on Monday of this week to move from preliminary and technical consideration of improvements in the international monetary system to a level of active negotiation among responsible policy officials.

This is the first phase of preparation for new and improved international monetary arrangements. I urge that these negotiations to identify a broad measure of underlying agreement go forward with concentration, vigor, and dispatch.

It is commendable that the Ministers of the Ten have requested the active participation in this first phase of preparation of the representatives of the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund and of the OECD and the Bank for International Settlements in these deliberations.

With respect to the Fund itself, it is the hope of the United States that in this first phase of preparation the management of the Fund will keep the Executive Directors fully appraised of work going on in the Group of Ten, and that the Fund will keep the Group of Ten informed of results of discussions and considerations by the Executive Board of the International Monetary Fund.

Beyond this, there lies a second phase of preparation of the utmost importance, on which the United States has been both insistent and persistent in its pursuit of appropriate preparation for an international monetary conference. This second phase should be designed primarily to assure that the basic interests of all members of the Fund in new arrangements for the future of the world monetary system will be adequately and appropriately considered and represented before significant intergovernmental agreements for formal structural improvements of the monetary system are concluded. Within the Fund membership there are variations in the extent to which individual countries are able to, or choose to, accumulate and hold large reserve balances. All, however, have a vital interest in the evolution of the world's monetary arrangements.

Twenty-one years ago, the Coordinating Committee of the Bretton Woods Conference submitted to the full Conference its report recommending that the IMF and IBRD be favorably considered by governments. The section of the report dealing with the IMF began with these words: "Since foreign trade affects the standards of life of every people, all countries have a vital interest in the system of exchange of national currencies and the regulations and conditions which govern its working."

I believe that thought is as true and as important today as it was in 1944.

It is true that only a limited number of countries hold the bulk of the official reserves of the world. No doubt these countries, including my own, have deep interests and responsibilities of a unique kind in the system by which reserves are generated and regulated. But other countries, which are not large reserve holders, also have legitimate and vital interests in these matters. This is why all the countries of the free world have a fair and reasonable claim that their views must be heard and considered at an appropriate stage in the process of international monetary improvement.

I welcome the action of the Group of Ten Ministers and Governors in recognizing this essential requirement for our continued efforts toward improvement of the free world's international monetary system. The United States views with hearty approval the Managing Director's suggestions to make suitable arrangements so that the efforts of the Executive Directors of the IMF and those of the Deputies of the Group of Ten can be directed toward a consensus as to desirable lines of action and the agreement of the Ministers of the Group of Ten on this point. We are looking forward to bringing together these two groups, which together can contribute so much experience and knowledge to the solution of the world's monetary problems, into full-fledged preparatory discussions. This combination provides an adequate and appropriate preparatory committee for a significant international monetary conference provided, of course, that a meaningful basis for substantive agreement can be reached in advance.

Let me close with a plea that formidable and complex as is the task of extending and improving the workings of our international monetary system, we lift our eyes from it long enough to see what it is, in reality, that we are about.

Let me say—and President Johnson's policies, in this respect, as in many others, are predicated upon this—that what we are engaged upon is the task of creating in the free world an international monetary structure strong enough, flexible enough, and with adequate elements of growth, to provide the financial framework for the building of a greater society of nations.

These international arrangements we debate, the improved international monetary system that we grope toward, are the extension of the great international task of economic development to which so many of us have dedicated so much of our resources.

I say this not to magnify our undertakings, but to give them the inspiration of their true perspective setting.

Let us build patiently, and strong, for much of our fondest hopes rest upon what we are undertaking in our monetary as in our development tasks. But there is too much to be done to permit us the luxury of delay. So let us go forward, with confidence that the institutions and processes of international consultation and collaboration we have brought into being are adequate to keep our problems from mastering us,

and that they will permit, instead, that we shall master our problems, in peace and increasing plenty.

U.S. RELATIONSHIPS WITH LATIN AMERICA

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, recent events have cast a spotlight on the problems which the U.S. Government faces in its relationships with our neighbors in Latin America. The questions raised by our intervention in the Dominican Republic will be the subject of dispute for many months to come. Critics of our role, such as the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, are answered by stanch supporters, such as our colleague, Congressman SELDEN, of Alabama. The House itself, by its passage of House Resolution 560, seems to lend its support to an open policy of intervention in any country threatened by a revolution involving Communist participation.

Indicative of another, and completely different policy approach, is our apparent success in developing a new treaty relationship with Panama, under which we will renounce our perpetual rights to the Panama Canal Zone. This should go a long way toward satisfying the Government and people of Panama that the United States does not demand special status for itself in the affairs of even the smallest of our neighbors, despite the critical importance of the Panama Canal to our security. In this action we find the role of administration critic and supporter reversed from what it was in the Dominican situation.

Underlying these particular situations, and many others which could be cited, is an almost schizophrenic attitude in both the Government and the people of this country toward our role in Latin America, and, indeed, toward the world at large. We are convinced of our own dedication to the goals of peace, freedom, democracy, and economic betterment for all our neighbors. We are amazed that these neighbors—and all the world is now our neighborhood—cannot recognize our unselffish devotion to their welfare.

Directly coupled with these high-minded goals in an almost abysmal ignorance of the facts about how we are involved in the affairs of our neighbors, both at the governmental and the private levels. This ignorance, may I say, extends even to the halls of the U.S. Congress.

Some of the reasons for this ignorance are quite clear. At the governmental level a great deal of our involvement with our neighbors is carried out by the "invisible government," a vast network of clandestine operations unknown even to those supposedly responsible for it. Citizens of the United States, including representatives of the press, are discouraged or prohibited from traveling in many countries of the world or from even receiving information about them. At the private level, our free-enterprise philosophy is used to justify noninterference with practices of American business abroad which we long ago ceased to tolerate in our own country.

I do not intend to deal, in these remarks, with all the implications of this situation, or with proposals which might help to correct it. Instead, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, September 26, 1965. The article is an abridgement of a series of articles written by one of the most respected journalists of my home State, Mr. C. K. McClatchy, associate editor of the Sacramento Bee. Mr. McClatchy spent nearly a month traveling in Cuba this summer, at the invitation of the British Ambassador, with the approval of both the Cuban Goverment and the U.S. State Department.

What he has written will shock many people, and in other times would have caused him, if he had been employed by the State Department, to have his security clearance revoked. For a Member of Congress to say these things would undoubtedly result in a hue and cry that he was "soft on communism," as was even the case with those 52 of us who voted against House Resolution 560.

Because the American public needs to be shocked out of its touching faith that someone up there in Washington has all the knowledge and all the wisdom concerning affairs in other countries, and because the policies originating in Washington are at the root of much of our ignorance today not only of Cuba, but of a large part of the rest of the world, I want to quote from portions of this article by Mr. McClatchy, and insert the complete article at the conclusion of my remarks.

He says:

Cuba today is not the island of misery, oppression, and starvation pictured by many Americans * * *. Basic to comprehending the Cubans' perspective is a knowledge of their society, before the revolution.

* * * * *

The gap between the rich and poor was vast. For example, there was only one small strip of beach open to the public among the 22 miles of beaches surrounding Havana. Now all beaches are public and overflowing with thousands of carefree Cubans who are not concerned about the elimination of the free enterprise system. From their perspective a great improvement has been made.

* * * * *

Shocking as this may sound, it should be kept in mind that the average Cuban does not feel that the present regime is any more repressive than the previous ones. And Castro's drastic renovation of the Cuban educational system remains the most popular reform undertaken by the regime. Almost everyone echoes the words of a Havana University student: "Before only the children of the rich could come. Now everyone who is qualified is admitted."

The basic reason Fidel and his revolution continue to be popular despite Cuba's many difficulties is that the people now have something of overriding value that they previously lacked—dignity.

Part of the Cuban resentment against the United States stems from the feeling that the Cuban dignity had been affronted and shabbily compromised by U.S. economic domination for generations.

* * * * *

The backbone of Fidel's support comes from people who benefited most from the breaking up of the old social structure.

Negroes, some 30 percent of the population, are particularly pro-Fidel. An unskilled worker in Havana said: "Thanks to Fidel there is real equality now * * *. Even if food is scarce, I don't mind, because now I am part of my country. Now the fight for Cuban survival is my fight. If this is communism, I'm all for it."

* * * * *

Before Castro, Cuban agriculture was dominated by immense sugar plantations owned mostly by foreigners, particularly Americans. Fidel instituted two basic agrarian reforms: In 1959, he prohibited private ownership of more than 1,000 acres, and in 1963, he reduced the maximum to 170 acres.

* * * * *

A cooperative farm in Havana Province includes 11 families on 150 acres. Corrado Avila, the co-op member in charge of culture and education, showed me the new housing which he said had been built as a reward for the stalwart production of the 11 families.

Comparing the old days when he was a day-worker on large farms, Avila said, "Sometimes I got as much as 5 pesos a day, but then I might have no job for weeks at a time. Now I get 3 pesos a day plus my share of the profits. In addition, I get milk and some potatoes for my family. Things are better now by a thousand to one."

* * * * *

But despite the success of the Castro regime, there are many opponents who feel that the improvements will be more than canceled out by the permanent loss of any hope of ever building a free society.

There are men who would have built the liberal, democratic Cuba which American policymakers say we want. But before the revolution, they were unable to make headway, primarily because of the indifference and insensitivity of the American Government.

A basic lesson we must learn is that our primary problem in Latin America is not communism; it is meeting a growing demand for social progress and material improvement.

* * * * *

We must understand that it is in our national interest to encourage certain essential revolutionary changes, even when they include nationalizing American business holdings. If we attempt to block the needed changes, we may delay them momentarily, but they will inevitably come, dictated then by a new Fidel Castro.

How many Members of Congress would be willing to admit that Cuba is not "the island of misery" we hear so much about, or that many Cubans would say, "If this is communism, I am all for it." It is difficult for us to comprehend that any people could prefer a revolutionary Communist system—particularly when, as in Cuba, they have had the benefit of so much enlightened U.S. assistance in improving their way of life.

Yet this is exactly what the American people and the Members of Congress must learn to understand. The threat which Castro communism poses for Latin America is not the threat of armed intervention from Cuba, or even the large-scale training and infiltration of armed guerrillas into other countries. It is the

threat posed by the fact that an insignificant country such as Cuba could successfully defy the might of the world's greatest power, and successfully produce a society more satisfactory to the masses of its people than existed before. The very knowledge that those things could occur is the key to revolutionary explosion among the oppressed and unhappy masses of Latin America—in the same way as the knowledge that nuclear fission was possible was the key to the eventual explosion of an atom bomb.

The revolutionary ideas of the American Founding Fathers, bulwarked by the example of a successful and dynamic country, inspired the vision of generations of great nationalist leaders and, in turn, helped mold the history of many countries without the intervention of a single American soldier or gun. In the same way, the success of revolutionary communism in overthrowing corrupt or decadent systems and in producing major improvements in industrial development, agriculture, health, and education, will inspire the vision of modern nationalist leaders. The masses of people these leaders must have supporting them in order to achieve success will flock to the support of those same leaders without the intervention of a single Communist guerrilla or a single gun from outside the country.

This is the cold, hard fact that the American people and the American Government should awaken to. This is the fact that we now purposely blind ourselves to by our policy of ignoring what is occurring in China, in Russia, in Cuba, and in other Communist-dominated countries. This is the fact that leads to our delusion that more weapons, more sophisticated weapons, bigger weapons, or smaller weapons can achieve victory for us anyplace in the world. No weapon is more powerful than the power of an idea that has taken hold. As the power of our weapons has increased, our ability to demonstrate the power of our ideas and to thereby capture the imagination of poor and oppressed masses has decreased in direct ratio.

Do I, therefore, feel that we must give in to Communist dictatorship around the world? By no means. I am as able as any of my colleagues to appreciate the evil in this dogmatic and materialistic philosophy—in the suppression of freedom and justice which it produces. But I cry out to you, with all my heart, to not let the American people become as blinded, as dogmatic, as materialistic, as unresponsive to the human spirit and its needs, or as unmindful of freedom and justice as those we oppose.

The people of the world yearn for the things we take for granted in this country—adequate food, shelter, education, opportunity in accordance with ability, participation in government, and justice under law—and they will die to achieve a world in which these things are available to them and their children. This country can, and should, lead the world in providing meaningful assistance to the underdeveloped world in achieving all of these goals. No Communist country can compete with us in bringing hope and progress to the world's needy if we examine this problem through eyes which are opened to the reality that exists around us.

We cannot achieve this leadership, however, by protecting a corrupt status quo. We cannot bring hope by exporting tanks, guns, and airplanes. We cannot create economic justice by absentee American ownership of 10,000-acre sugar plantations in Cuba, banana plantations in Guatemala, or oil resources in Venezuela. We cannot create democratic governments by providing technical assistance largely for the training of secret police, or for sending foreign generals to the Command and General Staff Schools. We cannot achieve fiscal stability, efficient administration, and sound national planning in underdeveloped countries by rewarding and encouraging an untaxed economic elite, a corrupt bureaucracy, and an ignorant despotism—none of which we would tolerate in our own country.

So Mr. Speaker, let us enter the battle with our eyes and our minds open to the realities of the world around us and with our hearts open to the aspirations of humanity—not with a dedication just to anticommunism but, instead, determined to open up the great potentialities of the human spirit for all of mankind. Then we shall prevail over all enemies.

The quoted article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 26, 1965]

CUBAN DIGNITY HAS SOARED AND CUBAN BELLY IS FULLER

(By C. K. McClatchy)

(NOTE.—A former reporter for the Washington Post and now associate editor of the Sacramento Bee, McClatchy visited Cuba this summer at the invitation of the British Ambassador there and with the approval of the Cuban Government and the U.S. State Department. The following is a condensation of a series of articles he wrote about the visit for the McClatchy newspapers of California.)

Cuba today is not the island of misery, oppression and starvation pictured by many Americans. Neither has Cuba achieved the unity and economic success claimed by the supporters of Fidel Castro's revolution.

However, a 3½-week visit traveling from one end of the Communist outpost to the other suggests that the present reality lies closer to the Castro hopes. Basic to comprehending the Cubans' perspective is a knowledge of their society before the revolution.

The gap between the rich and poor was vast. For example, there was only one small strip of beach open to the public among the 22 miles of beaches surrounding Havana. Now all beaches are public and overflowing with thousands of carefree Cubans who are not concerned about the elimination of the free enterprise system. From their perspective, a great improvement has been made.

Cubans do criticize present-day life. But the criticism centers on food and consumer goods shortages rather than the absence of free speech and a free press. Satisfying the stomach has priority over nurturing the spirit.

MUCHO MACHO

To the Cubans, Castro embodies the male virtues, the "macho" qualities admired so much in Latin America. He is the great man: he can cut cane faster than any other man on the island, he can pitch like Juan Marichal and hit like Mickey Mantle, he can talk longer and more eloquently than any other human being.

To the Cuban, Fidel, as Castro is universally called, personifies the revolution. Throughout Cuba, unpopular actions are blamed on "incompetent subordinates" and people say: "This wouldn't have happened if Fidel knew about it."

Fidel's following was illustrated to me by a young Cuban woman who wanted to start a new type of child care center. She sought Castro out in a provincial town where he was playing baseball and found him willing to listen at length to her. Finally, he told her to try the idea out and passed the word that she was to receive all necessary assistance.

His frequent slashing criticism of Government inefficiencies pleases the people. It gives expression to their own irritation and seems to demonstrate that Fidel really is on their side. They still seem most interested in adequate food, decent clothing, and entertainment and recreation. These things are not always so easy to come by under the revolution. Stores are poorly stocked, and when a shipment of needed goods does arrive from the Communist bloc countries, the supply usually runs out before the line of waiting housewives has been satisfied.

In the housing area, the Government has invested heavily in constructing new apartments for workers in Havana and small single family homes for farm labor in the provinces.

The Government also is trying hard to raise the Cuban cultural level, sending the National Ballet and symphony orchestras on frequent forays into the provinces. A company of folk dancers encourages pride in Cuba's mixed heritage by developing dances from special aspects of native life such as the voodoo practices still found within the Negro population.

SOME OPPOSITION

Still, there are those who oppose the revolution, but they lack organization and leadership.

The strongest opposition is caused by religious beliefs and students who resent the tightening control over teaching and the opportunities for advancement in industry. This has been fortified by the recent purges of students accused of being counterrevolutionaries or homosexuals.

Meanwhile, the government keeps tabs on the rest of the population through its nationwide snooping organization, the Committee for the Defense of the Revolution. The CDR is organized down to the city block and rural neighborhood level, and its dedicated local committees keep a sharp eye on the actions and comments of their neighbors.

Shocking as this may sound, it should be kept in mind that the average Cuban does not feel that the present regime is any more repressive than the previous ones. And Castro's drastic renovation of the Cuban educational system remains the most popular reform undertaken by the regime. Almost everyone echoes the words of a Havana University student: "Before only the children of the rich could come. Now everyone who is qualified is admitted."

The basic reason Fidel and his revolution continue to be popular despite Cuba's many difficulties is that the people now have something of overriding value that they previously lacked—dignity.

Part of the Cuban resentment against the United States stems from the feeling that the Cuban dignity had been affronted and shabbily compromised by the U.S. economic domination for generations.

Changes in the economy, education, and social structure are radical, and in most instances, irrevocable. The backbone of Fidel's support comes from people who benefited most from the breaking-up of the old social structure.

Negroes, some 30 percent of the population, are particularly pro-Fidel. An unskilled worker in Havana said:

"Thanks to Fidel, there is real equality now. * * * Even if food is scarce, I don't mind, because now I am part of my country. Now the fight for Cuban survival is my fight. If this is communism, I'm all for it."

Formerly landless farmworkers who were given their own small pieces of land or who work with others on farm cooperatives are another source of total support for Castro.

A farmer in Camaguey Province said: "Before Fidel, what one did was worth nothing because it was sweating for somebody else. Now it is worth everything."

This farmer knows little about ideology but he knows he is better off now than he was before.

Before Castro, Cuban agriculture was dominated by immense sugar plantations owned mostly by foreigners, particularly Americans. Fidel instituted two basic agrarian reforms: In 1959, he prohibited private ownership of more than 1,000 acres, and in 1963, he reduced the maximum to 170 acres.

Now, between 60 and 65 percent of farmland is owned by the state. The rest is owned by small private farmers, cooperatives, and agricultural societies. Much of the expropriated land was given to landless peasants and farmworkers, with a minimum of 66 acres for a family of five.

State farmworkers are given housing and medical care and receive a wage.

I visited a variety of farms during an auto tour of the six provinces. The wife of a private farmer in Camaguey told me, "We earned a little more before, but there is not much difference. We still have enough to eat."

Their produce has to be sold to the Government buying agency.

A cooperative farm in Havana Province includes 11 families on 150 acres. Corrado Avila, the co-op member in charge of culture and education, showed me the new housing which he said had been built as a reward for the "stalwart production" of the 11 families.

Comparing the old days when he was a day worker on large farms, Avila said, "Sometimes I got as much as 5 pesos a day, but then I might have no job for weeks at a time. Now I get 3 pesos a day plus my share of the profits. In addition, I get milk and some potatoes for my family. Things are better now by a thousand to one."

In Pinar del Rio Province, I visited a 15,000-acre state farm. There are 250 houses for the workers, new simple, and rough appearing. Each is surrounded by a tiny bit of land where workers grow crops to supplement their food supply. The farm includes facilities such as drugstores and social centers.

WHIM IS COMMAND

Agriculture does not appear to be Fidel's Achilles heel. And saying "Fidel's" is right, because he runs the country as if it were his giant and exciting toy. He has the power to order any idea into being on the whim of the moment, and exercises it quite regularly. The Government can dispense with the legislature because there is no room for debate on Fidel's plans.

But Fidel can't do everything and be everywhere, so he has a group of lieutenants who offer unquestioning personal loyalty. His brother, Raul, holds the key post of Minister of the Armed Forces.

Western observers think the Cuban Army is well trained, excellently disciplined and solidly pro-Castro. Russia has equipped it and assists in training. Estimates of its size range from 100,000 to 150,000 men. When Fidel achieved power, he said he would never permit conscription, but this was forgotten in 1963 when it was announced that all youths would be required to serve 3 years starting at age 17.

The volunteer militia also is a source of Castro power. Its members, men and women, stand guard at public buildings day and night. It is a vehicle to keep alive the sometimes flagging spirit of revolution now that the days of counterrevolutionaries are gone.

Whenever and however Fidel changed his early hostility to communism and developed his present curious combination of Castroism and communism, his commitment to it is complete. If he were to die tomorrow, the change in Cuba would be vast and unpredictable. His departure would leave a tremendous vacuum. It could be expected that the single party, PURSC, would attempt to take control with collective leadership. But the party has no existence of its own; it is an instrument of Fidel.

Thus it would be tempting to a leader such as Raul Castro, who controls the army, to attempt to seize control.

THE CHALLENGE NOW

But despite the success of the Castro regime, there are many opponents who feel that the improvements will be more than canceled out by the permanent loss of any hope of ever building a free society.

They are men who would have built the liberal, democratic Cuba which American policymakers say we want. But before the revolution, they were unable to make headway, primarily because of the indifference and insensitivity of the American Government.

A basic lesson we must learn is that our primary problem in Latin America is not communism; it is meeting a growing demand for social progress and material improvement.

American policy in Latin America needs to be less concerned with the fact that the Cuban revolution became Communist and more concerned with what caused the revolution.

We must understand that it is in our national interest to encourage certain essential revolutionary changes, even when they include nationalizing American business holdings. If we attempt to block the needed changes, we may delay them momentarily, but they will inevitably come, dictated then by a new Fidel Castro.

MODERNIZING CUSTOMS CHARGES FOR AIRCRAFT AND MARINE VESSELS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, there now exists a confusing and inequitable customs inspections policy along our national borders. Operators of small aircraft and maritime vessels who enter the country during other than weekday business hours are being caught in a strange game of chance that frequently proves more costly than entertaining. The element of chance involves who will check them across the border, a customs officer or an immigration officer. The winners of this game, those inspected by an immigration officer, are charged nothing. But the losers, those inspected by a customs officer, are charged for the officer's overtime wages. That cost can be as high as $60.

I am today introducing a bill that will end the unfairness of the present regulations, that will recognize the vast increase in small aircraft traffic, and that will promote increased commerce across our borders in the future. This bill will allow private and commercial aircraft flyers and operators of maritime vessels and other vehicles to return to the United States on weekends, holidays, and at night and still receive regular customs service without extra charges.

The roots of the problem that exists today go back more than 50 years. When the Tariff Act of 1911 was passed, Congress and the Bureau of Customs had no notion of the bright future of small aircraft as a common means of transportation. They were primarily concerned with the difficulties customs officers faced in patrolling our long borders, often on horseback. As an aid in controlling commerce, Congress and the Bureau wanted to discourage border crossing in other than the established business hours of 8 to 5.

The present practices were extended and firmly established in law by the Tariff Act of 1930. Since then flyers and maritime operators crossing the border after hours have had to pay the customs officer who is called to check them across the border for a full day's pay at overtime rates. The cost is divided between all of those who use the services of one particular officer during a single overtime period. But a traveler never knows whether he will have to pay the whole bill, up to $60, or only a portion of it.

The policy is inequitable, first of all, because people traveling by automobile can cross the border at any time without facing any charges. Congress realized some years ago that automobile travel was not something that should pass freely only during prime business hours. Still, to private aircraft, the Bureau of Customs is closed down for 60 days out of the year unless private parties agree to pay customs employees for what is legally considered a special service. Whether it could have been considered a special service 50, or even 30, years ago is not important. Now private international travel and foreign commerce both operate, and customs services are thus required, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

The policy is now wholly inconsistent in its application because the Immigration Service, whose officers in many instances also check persons through customs, do not charge overtime. They operate under different overtime laws than do the customs officers and can do this. Presently, at many ports of entry, immigration officers alternate weekend duty with customs officers. Thus we have the strange situation I first mentioned where a person can either be charged as much as $60 or nothing.

In introducing this bill, I believe that it is time we realize that offhour border crossings are no longer strange exceptions

that are more easily restricted than tolerated. In 1911 there were very few aircraft and fewer still engaging in international flight. Today there are more than 100,000 private aircraft and many more than 100,000 individuals who are licensed to fly. The total number of private pleasure boats is also growing very rapidly. In addition, there are many unscheduled commercial operators who cannot solve the dilemma of scheduling flights so as to best serve their clients and still schedule all of their departures or returns during business hours.

With this bill, we can solve present problems and future needs and recognize fully the importance of all modes of travel in international transportation.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN MILLS ON SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, on September 13 at a meeting of the Central Area Soil Conservation District in Little Rock, Ark., our colleague WILBUR MILLS delivered a masterful address on soil conservation.

It is my great pleasure to ask permission to insert his address as part of my remarks and also at the same time to express my thanks to our colleagues:

ADDRESS MADE AT THE SCD CENTRAL AREA MEETING SEPTEMBER 13, 1965, BY CONGRESSMAN WILBUR D. MILLS

It's a pleasure to be home once again and talk to you people who have done—and are doing—so much in conserving and developing the natural resources in Arkansas.

Our soil and water resources, as the air we breathe, are inseparable and irreplaceable assets that we must safeguard and develop to their maximum usefulness, for our strength as a nation stems from abundant natural resources wisely managed for the welfare of all Americans.

Here in Arkansas—as elsewhere in the Nation—we are pressed by an expanding population in the face of diminishing or static resources. Demands are multiplying for the use of these resources to satisfy the needs of our people. This in turn creates increasing competition among various interests for the use of these resources.

It is imperative that we in Arkansas intensify our going programs of soil and water conservation for the total good of all the people now and in the future.

At this very moment people in portions of the United States are feeling the brunt of a water shortage. The Northeast has entered its 4th year of drought. During the past 35 years most places in this region of the United States have had only one or two droughts that lasted as long as 2 years and only a couple of small areas had 4 year droughts.

The present drought began during the summer of 1961. However, moisture deficiencies did not reach serious proportions until the fall of 1963 when extreme drought severity was reached in Vermont.

Although spotty, drought conditions now extend into Ohio, West Virginia, Virginia, and Kentucky. There are many areas where farmers are hauling water for livestock, where crops are suffering, where small rural communities are rationing water supplies, and where rural industries have restricted operations. But we don't hear much about these for they happen somewhere every year.

What we do hear about is the water shortage in the Nation's largest metropolitan area, New York City.

I am sure you have all heard the story about the first graders in a metropolitan school who insisted that milk comes from the supermarket. These children, born and reared in a landscape of steel, concrete, and asphalt, seldom—if ever—had the opportunity to see a live cow.

Their parents, on the other hand, know that milk comes from a cow. But ask these same parents where their water comes from—a commodity they couldn't live without—and you might get as naive an answer as the first graders gave about the source of milk.

Of course, everyone knows that water comes from a faucet. But what's on the other end of that tap—the original source of the water—is rather vague to most urbanites. This is, indeed, disturbing to me as I know it must be to you. But the fact remains that far too many people know too little about our water resources.

Far too few know the interrelationship of land and water, that these twin resources are inseparable and must be treated accordingly.

I don't mean to dwell on the problems in the northeast. I fully realize that area is far removed from west south central United States and New York is a long way from Little Rock. But I do believe there is a lesson for all of us in the water shortage in the Northeast.

For this present water shortage is not all nature's doings. Most of it can be laid at the doorstep of man for not developing and properly managing his resources in the first place. New Yorkers must restrict their water uses, yet they can watch millions of gallons flow untouched down the Hudson River and into the ocean. The reason for this paradox is that the Hudson River has been polluted beyond human use. And this is man's doing.

The point I want to make is this: we have the know-how and the tools to avoid such misuses of our natural resources here in Arkansas. We have the opportunity to plan ahead. And—most important—we have the people and the organization to use the tools and take advantage of the opportunities.

You district supervisors are the people and your soil and water conservation districts is the organization.

I am proud of your accomplishments in resource development. You have always had and will continue to have my respect and my admiration. You are doing a job of tremendous significance for all of us. Let me emphasize those last few words—"for all of us."

For it is true that resource development benefits not only the farmer but also others in rural communities, those in the suburbs, and the people in the cities. We all have a stake in resource conservation.

Since what you are doing is for all the people, it would be unfair—and indeed an impossible financial burden—if you were asked to do it alone. With this in mind, I did a little digging to find out just what help you are getting in the way of funds and services to assist you in your work. I might add, I was pleased with the way things shape up in Arkansas.

Federal funds obligated to Arkansas in fiscal year 1965 amounted to $5.7 million. In addition, there was an estimated $2.5 million in funds from the State, local governments, and local people.

A breakdown of the Federal funds shows that $2.5 million went for assistance to districts; $175,000 for river basin work; $103,000 for small watershed project planning; $2.9 million for watershed project construction and related work; and $21,000 for work on Arkansas' pilot watershed project, Six-Mile Creek.

Of the non-Federal funds, $228,500 went toward district operations; $100,000 for watershed planning; and $2.2 million for watershed project construction.

It is refreshing to note that the funds allocated for fiscal year 1966 show an increase from both Federal and non-Federal sources.

Earmarked for this fiscal year in Arkansas from the Federal Government are funds totaling $6.3 million. A total of $2.5 million will be used for district operations; $28,000 for river basin study; $121,000 for watershed planning; $3.3 million for watershed construction; and $25,000 on the Six-Mile Creek project.

Non-Federal funds for fiscal 1966 total $2.8 million. Of this $253,000 will go for district operations; $100,000 for watershed planning; and $2.5 million for installation of watershed improvement measures.

To date a total of $12.5 million have been obligated for watershed project construction in Arkansas which is equivalent to 500 man-years of local employment.

In addition there are substantial cost-sharing funds available through the agricultural conservation program for conservation measures and funds for conservation loans from the Farmers Home Administration.

Nationally, not all States are in such a fortunate position. Arkansas, as you well know, is a frontrunner among the States in its contributions of funds and services to the soil conservation district program. This interest taken by the State and local governments has done much to accelerate conservation work in Arkansas.

Nevertheless, the bulk of the credit goes to you people who actually get the work accomplished. Arkansas has an extremely good record in conservation treatment measures applied on the land. It stands among the top 10 percent in the Nation in soil and water conservation work accomplished.

In Public Law 566 work, Arkansas ranks fifth in the Nation with 105 watershed applications. It ranks fourth in both projects approved for planning (40) and projects approved for operations (31)—a record of which you can be justly proud.

I am told that through the small watershed program in Arkansas there has been planned for construction a total of about 160 floodwater retarding structures and 842 miles of channel improvement. Also, 66 stabilizing and sediment control structures have been built and 125 miles of mains and laterals have been established.

Your interest in watershed development is reflected in the fact that to date local sponsors have obtained easements and rights-of-way valued in excess of $1.4 million from about 1,300 landowners to install Public Law 566 structures. Your interest has gone unrewarded.

The results of the watershed program in Arkansas have been impressive, especially the multipurpose project work.

Right now, 2,400 people in the communities of Lincoln and Waldron are receiving much needed water from two multipurpose watershed projects.

Lincoln, a community of 1,000, located in the Muddy Fork of Illinois River Watershed, was in critical need of additional water due to decreasing flow of springs that supplied the town. During the long, dry summers of 1962 and 1963, it was necessary to haul water and severely restrict its use. Today Lincoln residents use water without restrictions. Two multipurpose reservoirs in the watershed project can supply the com-

munity with 2 million gallons of high quality water a day. With an ample supply of water, the community is now aggressively seeking a new industry.

The story in the Poteau River Watershed is slightly different. The community of Waldron had the industry—employing a minimum of 350 people—but just about lost it due to an insufficient supply of water.

The reason they didn't lose it is because Waldron city officials joined forces with local farmers in sponsoring the Poteau River Watershed project for flood prevention and municipal water. The multipurpose reservoir—with storage for 2,100 acre-feet of municipal water—was completed in April 1964 and put into use shortly thereafter.

The local industry went back into production, added another shift, and plans to add still another in the future.

With results like this, I must say you are making good use of the funds and tools available to you for resource conservation and development. I also want to commend you and the State conservation commission on your role in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program this past summer. I read with interest the report on this in the July issue of your newsletter.

I am sure your cooperation in this venture not only accelerated the resource development program in Arkansas, but also gave 256 youths the opportunity to develop worthwhile skills.

It's examples like this that convince me that Arkansas is moving ahead in resource development.

We all know that Arkansas was the first in the Nation to enact a district law. This year it chalked up another first—the first to give districts the legal authority to carry out all phases of Public Law 566 program which was accomplished by amendments to the State soil and water conservation law by the 65th general assembly. The legislature and the Governor are to be congratulated for this accomplishment.

This change certainly strengthens the district's position in many respects. It has long been my contention that soil and water conservation districts should be the responsible local group, equipped with the necessary powers, to carry out conservation and development work on all the area's renewable natural resources.

The amended district act now gives you more opportunity and more freedom in planning and directing the resource conservation work within the State. The districts are now in a position to become more active and broaden their scope of activities. You district supervisors may now look to the future with more confidence than ever before in seeking new tools in resource development.

There are and will be increasing opportunities for you to initiate projects on your own and join other groups in cooperative ventures. I know Sterlin Hurley, your association president, has sent Governor Faubus recommendations for soil conservation district participation in the proposed Ozark area regional program under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Under this act, administered by the Department of Commerce, grants and loans may be available to districts for acquisition and/or conservation and development of land, water, and related resources for public works, public service, or development facility usage.

Also supplementary grants may be available to districts to assist people in meeting their share of costs in watershed protection projects.

Under the act, districts in designated areas may have the opportunity to accelerate the watershed program, soil surveys, technical assistance to individual landowners, and in other areas.

It is of paramount importance that you continue to seek new tools and new avenues to carry out resource development work. We are making definite progress. The advances in resource development during the past few years are notable because they have occurred in so short a space of time. But so much remains to be done.

You and I know that resource conservation and development qualifies as a top priority job under the most rigid set of standards that can be applied.

But for us to know this is not enough. Others must be made to know—and to understand—and to act.

One way to accomplish this is by bringing all conservation interests together. Only then will the term "conservation" have full meaning.

You can do much to bring this about. For 30 years now your voice has been heard—and it has had impact. Your challenge is to continue to make your voice heard—and your leadership felt.

I will do my part to help. Let us push forward together until we have built a firm foundation for permanent prosperity in all America.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORRIS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for September 29 and 30, on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa, for October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. REDLIN, for October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa, for September 30 and October 1, on account of official business.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska, for September 29 through October 5, 1965, on account of National Parks Subcommittee field hearings.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS), for 60 minutes, on September 30, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEL CLAWSON), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. CLEVELAND.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes;

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes; and

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts in the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 205. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 728. An act to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936;

H.R. 1274. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams; and

H.J. Res. 673. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1966, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1628. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 (H. Doc. 295), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1582. A bill to

provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1098). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KING of California: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8210. A bill to amend the International Organizations Immunities Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1099). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11029. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain woven fabrics of vegetable fibers (except cotton); with amendment (Rept. No. 1100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. H.R. 2580. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1101). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11319. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 11320. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11321. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11322. A bill to provide a program of Federal assistance to elementary schools throughout the Nation to improve educational opportunities through provisions for the services of child development specialists and to provide a program of Federal assistance for the training of such elementary school personnel in the institutions of higher education, and for other educational purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11323. A bill to provide salary incentives for teachers who choose to teach children in elementary and secondary schools in school districts having high concentration of low-income families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 11324. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 11325. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on certain unwrought copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 11326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to the pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 11327. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that certain social security benefits may be waived and not counted as income under that section; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11328. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Alcoholism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11329. A bill to provide for the designation of the ship *Constellation* as a national historic shrine and as the first ship of the Navy; and to provide further that the flag of the United States of America may be flown for 24 hours of each day over the *Constellation*; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 11330. A bill to prohibit the transportation or shipment in interstate commerce of master keys to persons prohibited by State law from receiving or possessing them; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 11332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11334. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the memory of the late General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 11335. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11336. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 11337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove certain limitations on the amount of the deduction for contributions to pension and profit-sharing plans made on behalf of self-employed individuals and to change the definition of "earned income" applicable with respect to such plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 11338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 11339. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11340. A bill to amend section 203(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide for a program of research and development by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to reduce or eliminate aircraft noise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 11341. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 11342. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill any employee of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service when such employee is engaged in certain inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 11343. A bill to promote the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by modernizing practices of the Federal Government relating to the inspection of persons, merchandise, and conveyances moving into, through, and out of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 11344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing training programs for employees and prospective employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.J. Res. 675. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.J. Res. 676. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 592. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the "Compilation of Social Security Laws"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, a memorial of the following title was introduced and referred, as follows:

369. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 11345. A bill for the relief of Ernest Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11346. A bill for the relief of Felice Patrizio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11347. A bill for the relief of Maria Anna Piotrowski, formerly Czeslawa Marek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 11348. A bill for the relief of Mr. Allan V. Farmer, his wife Madge-Isobel, and three children, Allana Catherine, Nancy Heather, and Julian Madge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 11349. A bill for the relief of Manuel Tavares Melo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 11350. A bill for the relief of Stanley Pulczynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 11351. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edouard Abdul Karim Naim and their children, Alexis Edouard, Gebrail Edouard, and Sylvana Edouard Naim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene Darzenta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 11353. A bill for the relief of CWO Maurice Klatch, U.S. Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

273. Mr. KING of Utah presented a petition of the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, the Christopher D. Smithers Foundation, and the National Council on Alcoholism, concerning alcoholism control activity at the Federal level, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Bishop Kenneth W. Copeland, D.D., S.T.D., LL.D., resident bishop, Nebraska area of the Methodist Church, of Lincoln, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Father of us all, we praise Thee for Thy matchless love for all people and for the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Forgive us when we insist on our liberty yet fail to respond with our loyalty; when we would welcome our opportunities but would refuse to accept our obligations, and especially when we receive the gifts of life while we reject the Giver of life.

We thank Thee for the United States of America, this great country whose sons and daughters we are and in whose bosom we have learned the meaning of freedom and brotherhood. We thank Thee for the Senate, this body of men and women charged with such destiny-making responsibilities. Grant them wisdom; grant them courage for the creative tasks to which they set their minds and their hearts. Keep ever before them the light of Thy truth and the presence of Thy spirit.

Bring to our troubled world Thy peace, O Thou Prince of Peace, by Thy power and through our obedience unto Thee. Give mankind both the knowledge and the courage to translate the instruments that make for war into the implements that make for peace. Help us to eradicate from the earth the basic enemies of mankind: illiteracy, illness, and hunger. By Thy great might, O God, save us from fear, hatred, greed, and impurity of life. Let Thy light shine through our darkness and despair, and let our hearts know the peace that passes understanding. Lead on, O King Eternal, we humbly pray in the spirit and name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 28, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CHELF, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. CAHILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1065. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes;

S. 1620. An act to consolidate the two judicial districts in the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; and

S. 1766. An act to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to public and quasi-public agencies and corporations not operated for profit with respect to water supply, water systems, and waste disposal systems serving rural areas and to make grants to aid in rural community development planning and in connection with the construction of such community facilities, to increase the annual aggregate of insured loans thereunder, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 28, 1965, the following report of a committee was submitted subsequent to adjournment on September 28, 1965:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1719. A bill to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 793).

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William H. Stewart, of Maryland, to be Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

PROTOCOL TO CONVENTION WITH GERMANY RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive I, 89th Congress, 1st session, a Convention Between the United States and Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation With Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Bonn, September 17, 1965, modifying the convention of July 22, 1954, which was transmitted to the Senate today. I ask unanimous consent that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and